





ard Akroyd.

Library of the
Church Divinity School
of the Pacific



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

AUTHORIZED REPORT
OF
The Proceedings
OF THE
CHURCH CONGRESS

HELD AT
YORK,
ON TUESDAY, WEDNESDAY, AND THURSDAY,

OCTOBER 9TH, 10TH, &

1866.

York:

JOHN SAMPSON, 13, CONEY

London:

RIVINGTONS, WATERLOO PLACE.

HIGH STREET,
Oxford,

TRINITY STREET,
Cambridge.

1867.



YORK:

PRINTED BY JOHN SAMPSON, CONEY STREET.

LS70.2

CC

1866

THE following sheets have been submitted to the correction of their authors as far as it was possible. The only exceptions are the Papers of the Lord Bishop of Calcutta and the Rev. Canon Shirley, D.D., (who died shortly after the Congress,) and the Speeches of two or three members who had gone abroad, or left no address. The two papers were fully and clearly written out by their lamented authors, and the speeches have been carefully corrected by the Editor from the shorthand writer's report.

Unfortunately several other papers were not so complete; this neglect, together with the time consumed in the transmission of the proof sheets, has thrown the Report (in spite of every effort to the contrary) almost as late as its predecessor at Norwich. It is to be hoped that the Wolverhampton Executive may be more fortunate. A proposal to this end, received after the Congress was over, from the Right Hon. Earl Nelson, is given in the Appendix.

G. T.

York, March 7, 1867.

PRAYERS

*At the opening of all Meetings of the Executive Committee
and Congress.*

Lord have mercy, &c.

Christ have mercy, &c.

Lord have mercy, &c.

Our Father, which art in heaven, Hallowed be Thy Name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, As it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses, As we forgive them that trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation; But deliver us from evil: For Thine is the kingdom, The Power, and the glory, For ever and ever. Amen.

O LORD, we beseech thee mercifully to receive the prayers of thy people which call upon thee; and grant that they may both perceive and know what things they ought to do, and also may have grace and power faithfully to fulfil the same; through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

ALMIGHTY and everlasting God, by whose Spirit the whole body of the Church is governed and sanctified; Receive our supplications and prayers, which we offer before thee for all estates of men in thy holy Church, that every member of the same, in his vocation and ministry, may truly and godly serve thee; through our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. *Amen.*

YORK CHURCH CONGRESS, 1866.

On the 18th December, 1865, the Honourable and Very Reverend the Dean of York, in pursuance of the resolutions of a private preliminary Meeting, issued a circular inviting guarantees to the amount of a guinea towards the expenses of the proposed Congress. The main object of this proposal was to collect a large body of Churchmen, to form the basis of the organization.

A Meeting of the Guarantors was held in the Minster Vestry, on the 4th January, 1866, his Grace the Archbishop of York, President, in the chair. It was then resolved—

- 1.—That certain noblemen and gentlemen be requested to act as Vice Presidents, with others to be invited by the Executive Committee.
- 2.—That the Executive Committee do consist of his Grace the President, the Dean of York, the Archdeacons, the Lord Mayor, with twelve clergymen and as many laymen, three honorary secretaries and a paid assistant, to be appointed by the Committee.
- 3.—That a Reception Committee be formed of the city authorities, beneficed clergymen of York, and others, with two honorary secretaries.
- 4.—That the Lord Mayor be requested to act as Treasurer.
- 5.—That the Vice Presidents be requested to form Local Committees in their respective neighbourhoods in communication with the Executive Committee.

The Executive Committee met on the 11th January, when the President nominated his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury as Preacher, and the 9th of October was fixed for the assembly of the Congress. It was resolved to consider the business of the committee confidential. Committee meetings were also held on the 19th January, 8th March, 10th April, 18th May, 19th June, 5th July, 14th July, 8th August, 18th September, 5th October, and in permanence during the sitting of the Congress.

At these meetings the subjects proposed for discussion were brought forward and entered on a Provisional List, together with the names of persons to be invited to take part in the proceedings. It was agreed that not more than two papers and two spoken addresses should be invited on each subject; and these, as far as possible, to represent the different aspects of the question in the Church.

Throughout the whole eight months the Secretaries were engaged in constant communications with the individuals proposed, and numerous others, to obtain the necessary co-operation. The Provisional List was printed from time to time for the confidential use of the Committee, and, to secure the ripest deliberation, both subjects and names were given in *Italics* on the first proposal, and in Roman letters after being approved at two Committee Meetings.

Very many of the persons applied to were unable to accept the invitation, and some were compelled to withdraw after agreeing to take papers.

The Provisional List, having been thus slowly matured till it contained *twenty-six* subjects, was then reduced to *fifteen* by weeding out those which failed to secure a majority on the question. The Scheme was arranged for two sections only; but the Committee having resolved on the 18th September to follow the example introduced at Norwich, and devote one evening to a *Conversazione*, a third section was unavoidable. This change (though much regretted at the time) had the unforeseen advantage of leaving the Congress Hall vacant for the Working Men's Meeting, which proved the most striking feature of the York gathering. The origin of this interesting event is described in the Archbishop's Preface to the Report of the proceedings.

The arrangements were far advanced when attention was drawn to the fact that the largest public room would not afford proper accommodation for more than 1500 persons, while there was reason to expect at least 2000 members of Congress. On the 14th July, the Committee resolved to erect a wooden building on a site in the Minster Yard, granted by the Dean and Chapter, at a cost of £500. Applications for donations was made to the leading Churchmen of the county, and the balance was defrayed by the guarantors. By the spirited exertions of the Architects (Messrs. J. & W. Atkinson, of York), the New Congress Hall was completed a fortnight before the time of meeting. Its dimensions were 104 feet in length, 64 feet in breadth, and 38 feet extreme height. A deep gallery surrounded three sides, and on the fourth was an elevated platform placed in an apse. Two thousand three hundred persons were provided with seats commanding a full view of the Chair and the speakers, and so excellent were the acoustic properties that every word was heard in the remotest corners.

The front of the galleries was decorated with the armorial

bearings of the English, Irish, and Scottish Sees, with the metropolitan Sees of the Colonial Church; shields blazoned with the stars and stripes of the United States, bore the initials of the Bishops who honoured the Congress from that country. Over the Chair were placed the Arms of the Archiepiscopal Sees of England and the City of York, with the motto, "*Salus in amplitudine consiliariorum.*" These decorations were mostly the work of a few ladies at York.

The Congress was threatened with a serious impediment by the refusal of the Railway Companies to issue return-tickets at a reduced fare, as on former occasions. His Grace the President, with the Treasurer and Senior Secretary, went as a Deputation, to the Board of the North Eastern Company, where the objection arose, and letters were written to the principal Railway Companies in the United Kingdom, but no remonstrance could shake the illiberal determination.

In spite, however, of this unexpected check the York Church Congress numbered the unprecedented attendance of 3,073 members,¹ including the Archbishops of Canterbury and York; the Bishop Primus of Scotland; the Bishops of Oxford, Ripon, Chester, Down, Kilmore, Barbados, Antigua, Adelaide, Dunedin, and Nelson, with the American Bishops, Dr. Whitehouse of Illinois, Dr. Bacon of Pennsylvania, and Dr. Atkinson of North Carolina, whose presence formed another of the peculiar features of this Congress. The Bishop of London had accepted the President's invitation, but was arrested by the recurrence of a serious malady.

The Bishops, Deans, and Archdeacons who attended the Congress, were invited to join the Dean and Chapter in receiving the three Primates at the West Door of the Cathedral; and as the long procession passed through the crowded nave and choir, to their appointed seats in the sanctuary, it was felt that the formal sanction of our Church-rulers was unmistakeably given to the principle of the Congress,—the united action of churchmen, clerical and lay, in the interests of their common heritage.

The means of accomodating so large a company in our ancient but not spacious City, formed the subject of some misgivings. The Senior Secretary of the Reception Committee sat daily to furnish information and forward invitations, and anxiety was quickly dispelled by the ready exercise of private hospitality. The Palace, the

¹ Congress Tickets, 2,147. Day Tickets, 926.

Deanery, the Residence, the Mansion House, with the Lord Mayor's private residence, were taxed to the utmost of their capacity; hardly a private house was without guests, and the tide overflowed into the parsonages of the neighbouring villages. It is to be hoped that any who failed to receive the private attentions which were their due, have been good enough to attribute the deficiency to its true cause—our limited means of reception. The Secretaries cannot sufficiently express their sense of the kindness and forbearance manifested under the pressure to which their exertions were subjected.

The Lord Mayor and Aldermen attended the opening meeting in their scarlet robes, with the sword and mace. The Guildhall, kindly granted for the purpose, was fitted up for the Reception Room, and a Register lay there for receiving the names of members of Congress. Numbers, however, in spite of every effort went away without being recorded.

The York Congress was further distinguished by bringing to completion the formation of a Central Committee, which was proposed at Manchester in 1863, and successively passed on from Bristol and Norwich to York.

The Executive Committee met for the last time on the 8th Nov., when having ordered the accounts to be audited and discharged, they passed votes of thanks to the Hon. Secretaries, and to Dr. Monk for his assistance in providing the musical illustrations to the Lecture on English Church Hymnody.

The Committee then dissolved, leaving a grateful impression on all who had laboured in the work that, amid the trials and deficiencies of the age, the Church of England is her country's surest hope, and the good hand of her God still sustains and blesses her.

GEORGE TREVOR,	} HON. SECS.
EDWIN FOX,	
WILLIAM A. WIGHTMAN,	
G. WILBERFORCE TREVOR, ASSIST. SEC.	

Patron and President.

HIS GRACE THE ARCHBISHOP OF YORK.

Treasurer.

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE JAMES MEEK, LORD MAYOR OF YORK.

Vice Presidents.

The Lord Bishop of London.
 The Lord Bishop of Oxford.
 The Lord Bishop of Ripon.
 The Lord Bishop of Bangor.
 The Lord Bishop of Chester.
 The Lord Bishop of Down and Connor.
 The Lord Bishop of Kilmore.
 The Lord Bishop of Barbados.
 The Lord Bishop of Newfoundland.
 The Lord Bishop of Adelaide.
 The Lord Bishop of Antigua.
 The Lord Bishop of Nelson.
 The Lord Bishop of Dunedin.
 The Lord Bishop of Moray and Ross.
 The Lord Bishop of Illinois.
 The Lord Bishop of North Carolina.
 The Lord Bishop of Pennsylvania.
 The Earl of Harewood.
 The Earl of Effingham.
 Lord Fredk. Cavendish, M.P.
 The Lord Teignmouth.
 The Lord Wharnccliffe.
 The Lord Feversham.
 The Lord De L'Isle.
 The Lord Wenlock.
 The Lord Houghton.
 The Lord Muncaster.
 The Lord Mayor of York.
 Rt. Hon. Gathorne Hardy, M.P.
 The High Sheriff of Yorkshire.
 The Hon. and Very Rev. The Dean of York.
 The Hon. Payan Dawnay.
 The Hon. W. E. Duncombe, M.P.
 The Hon. Admiral Duncombe, M.P.
 The Hon. Admiral Howard.
 The Hon. Egremont Lascelles.
 The Hon. C. Lindley Wood.
 Sir Charles Anderson, Bart.
 The Rev. Sir Thos. E. W. Blomefield,
 Bart.
 Sir Henry Boynton, Bart.
 Sir George Cholmley, Bart.
 Sir Henry Edwards, Bart, M.P.
 Sir J. V. B. Johnstone, Bart., M.P.
 Sir John Lowther, Bart.
 Sir G. Wombwell, Bart.
 Edwd. Akroyd, Esq., M.P.
 James Brown, Esq., M.P.
 J. Dent Dent, Esq., M.P.
 A. J. B. Beresford Hope, Esq., M.P.
 George Leeman, Esq., M.P.
 James Lowther, Esq., M.P.
 F. A. Milbank, Esq., M.P.
 Francis J. Powell, Esq., M.P.
 Christr. Sykes, Esq., M.P.
 H. W. Wickham, Esq., M.P.
 Basil J. Woodd, Esq., M.P.
 The Very Rev. The Dean of Carlisle.
 The Ven. The Archdeacon of York.
 The Ven. The Archdeacon of Cleveland.
 The Ven. The Archdeacon of the East
 Riding.

The Ven. The Archdeacon of Craven.
 The Ven. The Archdeacon of Richmond.
 The Rev. A. Gatty, D.D., Subdean of York.
 The Rev. Canon Preston.
 The Rev. Canon Croft.
 The Rev. Canon Coates.
 The Rev. Canon Johnstone.
 The Rev. Canon Gooch.
 The Rev. Canon Dixon.
 The Rev. Canon Trevor.
 The Rev. Canon Wray.
 The Rev. Canon Randolph.
 The Rev. Canon Yeoman.
 The Rev. Canon Dunnington Jefferson.
 The Hon. and Rev. Canon Baillie.
 The Rev. Canon Hey.
 The Rev. Canon Sale, D.D.
 The Rev. Canon Robinson.
 The Rev. Canon Jarratt.
 The Hon. and Rev. Canon Howard.
 The Rev. Canon Jones.
 The Rev. Canon Paget.
 The Rev. Canon Raine.
 The Rev. H. Ainslie.
 The Rev. Canon Atlay, D.
 The Rev. Chas. Bailey.
 The Rev. F. A. Bartlett.
 The Rev. Thos. Bayly.
 The Rev. H. F. Barnes.
 The Rev. J. Beresford.
 The Rev. T. H. Bissett, D.D.
 The Rev. R. F. L. Blunt.
 The Rev. H. F. Brock.
 The Rev. Canon Camidge.
 The Rev. C. Cator.
 The Rev. W. A. Cartledge.
 The Rev. Thos. Collins.
 The Rev. Phipps Champneys.
 The Rev. W. F. Douglas.
 The Rev. R. Elwyn.
 The Rev. C. P. Eden.
 The Rev. J. W. Geldart, LL.D.
 The Rev. R. W. B. Hornby, D.D.
 The Rev. W. Ward Jackson.
 The Rev. H. W. Kemp.
 The Rev. W. Kingsley.
 The Rev. F. D. Legard.
 The Rev. Y. G. Lloyd.
 The Rev. J. T. B. Landon.
 The Rev. T. W. Mercer.
 The Rev. Thos. Monson.
 The Rev. Canon Musgrave.
 The Rev. D. R. Roundell.
 The Rev. J. Robinson.
 The Rev. J. Sharp.
 The Rev. Corbet Singleton.
 The Rev. R. Stainforth.
 The Recorder of York, Q.C.
 Mr. Alderman Wood.
 Mr. Alderman Richardson.
 Mr. Alderman Evers.
 Mr. Alderman Hargrove.

George Armitage, Esq.
Thos. Barstow, Esq.
R. Barry, Esq.
J. Hope Barton, Esq.
H. Boleklow, Esq.
W. T. Coltman, Esq.
William Clough, Esq.
C. A. Darley, Esq.
R. Davies, Esq.
Joseph Dent, Esq.
Geo. Dodsworth, Esq.
Benj. Dodsworth, Esq.
Jas. Lancelot Foster, Esq.
G. Lane Fox, Esq.
W. Gray, Esq.
Jno. Greenwood, Esq.
J. J. Gutch, Esq.
Egerton V. Harcourt, Esq.
Jno. Holtby, Esq.
W. D. Husband, Esq.
Meynell Ingram, Esq.
H. Keyworth, Esq.
George Legard, Esq.
Col. Little.
W. S. Markham, Esq.
W. Matterson, Esq., M.D.

W. J. S. Morritt, Esq.
Henry Newton, Esq.
S. W. North, Esq.
Joshua Oldfield, Esq.
George Oldfield, Esq.
W. O'Brien, Esq.
T. C. Paley, Esq.
Lieut.-Col. J. W. Pease.
W. F. Rawdon, Esq.
C. Richardson, Esq.
D. Russell, Esq.
W. Rutson, Esq.
Geo. Shann, Esq., M.D.
J. G. Smyth, Esq.
W. Spencer Stanhope, Esq.
George Swann, Esq.
W. H. Travis, Esq.
Leonard Thompson, Esq.
C. A. Thiselton, Esq.
J. P. Brown-Westhead, Esq.
W. Whytehead, Esq.
E. J. Winn, Esq.
Jno. Woodall, Esq.
Robert Wylie, Esq.
G. J. Yarburgh, Esq.
Edwd. York, Esq.

Executive Committee.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF YORK, *President.*

The Lord Mayor of York.
The Dean of York.
The Archdeacon of York.
The Archdeacon of Cleveland.
The Archdeacon of the East Riding.
Rev. H. Ainslie.
Rev. J. Atlay, D.D.
Rev. W. A. Cartledge.
Rev. R. Elwyn.
Rev. Canon Hey.
Rev. Canon Jones.
Hon. and Rev. James Lascelles.
Rev. A. St. John Mildmay.
Rev. G. H. Philips.
Rev. Canon Randolph.

Rev. S. Wainwright.
Rev. Canon Yeoman.
Hon. Payan Dawnay.
J. J. Gutch, Esq.
Egerton V. Harcourt, Esq.
W. D. Husband, Esq.
George Legard, Esq.
W. Matterson, Esq., M.D.
J. Forth Munby, Esq.
W. O'Brien, Esq.
Joshua Oldfield, Esq.
W. Richardson, Esq.
Geo. Shann, Esq., M.D.
David Russell, Esq.

HONORARY SECRETARIES: Rev. Canon Trevor. Rev. Edwin Fox. Rev. W. A. Wightman.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY: George Wilberforce Trevor, Esq.

Reception Committee.

The Lord Mayor.
The Sheriff.
The Aldermen.
The Town Clerk.
The Beneficed Clergy of York.
R. A. Clark, Esq.
J. L. Foster, Esq.

H. Keyworth, Esq.
S. W. North, Esq.
R. Perkins, Esq.
D. Russell, Esq.
R. E. Smithson, Esq.
Oswald Smithson, Esq.

HONORARY SECRETARIES: Rev. Thos. Myers. Rev. S. Wainwright.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Sermon by His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury	3
Opening of Congress	15
Inaugural Address by His Grace the Archbishop of York	16
Obligations and Due Observance of the Lord's Day	21
" Paper by the Lord Bishop of Ripon	21
" Paper by the Rev. T. E. Espin	27
" Discussion—Right Hon. Joseph Napier	33
" " Rev. H. Stevens	35
" " Archdeacon Denison	36
" " Mr. Beresford Hope, M.P.	37
" " Rev. J. Baudinet	38
Social Condition and Recreation of the Poorer Classes	38
" Paper by the Rev. E. J. Randolph	38
" Paper by the Hon. and Rev. Canon Lyttleton	47
" Discussion—Colonel Akroyd, M.P.	54
" " Rev. W. Caine	56
" " Mr. Powell, M.P.	57
" " Rev. J. T. Landon	58
" " Lord Teignmouth	58
" " Mr. Powell, M.P.	60
" " Rev. Canon Atlay	60
" " Mr. James Lord	61
" " Rev. T. A. Stowell	61
" " Lord Bishop of Ripon (the Chairman)	61
Colonial Church and Foreign Missions	62
" Address by the Chairman (the Bishop of Oxford)	62
" Paper by the Rev. W. Kay, D.D.	64
" Paper by the Rev. E. Garbett	69
" Paper by the Bishop of Calcutta	77
" Discussion—Dean of Capetown	86
" " Mr. E. B. Cowell	88
" " Bishop of Pennsylvania	88
" " Mr. Beresford Hope, M.P.	89
" " Bishop of Newfoundland	90
" " Bishop of North Carolina	91
" " Bishop of Oxford	91

	PAGE
Preaching (Dogmatic Teaching from the Pulpit)	92
" Paper by the Dean of Emly	92
" Paper by the Rev. Professor Shirley, D.D.	101
" Discussion—Dean of Cork	108
" Mr. Sidney Owen	111
" Bishop of Oxford	114
" Rev. Canon Woodgate	115
" Rev. A. R. Faussett	117
" Rev. F. A. Hildyard	118
" Rev. W. Wallace	119
Diocesan and Parochial Organization	120
" Paper by the Rev. Canon Atlay, D.D.	120
" Paper by the Rev. W. Cadman	127
" Discussion—Rev. Prebendary Mackarness	132
" Rev. Dr. Wilkinson	133
" Earl of Harrowby, K.G.	134
" Rev. J. Beaumont	136
" Rev. George Lewthwaite	136
" Archdeacon Emery	137
" Mr. Rutson	138
" Archdeacon Hamilton	139
" Dean of Ely	140
" Rev. P. S. Duval	141
Adult and Sunday Schools and Catechizing	141
" Paper by the Rev. E. Jackson	141
" Paper by the Rev. F. Hessey, D.C.L.	148
" Discussion—Rev. J. Bardsley	160
" Rev. Dr. Howson	161
" Earl Nelson	162
" Mr. G. Warrington	162
" Rev. B. Douglas	163
" Mr. J. G. Fitch	163
" Rev. W. Caine	164
" Rev. J. Field	164
Lay Agency in the Church's Work	165
" Paper by the Right Hon. Earl Nelson	165
" Paper by the Archdeacon of London	171
" Discussion—Rev. Canon Durnford	176
Female Ministrations.....	178
" Paper by the Earl of Devon.....	178
" Paper by the Rev. Dr. Howson	186
" Discussion—Hon. Archdeacon Harris	193
Cathedrals—their proper Work and Influence	195
" Speech by the Chairman (the Dean of York).....	195
" Paper by the Dean of Ely.....	196
" Paper by the Rev. Canon Raine	203

"	Discussion—Dean of Chichester.....	208
"	" Rev. Precentor Walcott, F.S.A.....	210
"	" Mr. Beresford Hope, M.P.....	211
"	" Rev. A. Shadwell.....	212
"	" Rev. C. H. Seymour	213
The Conversazione		213
Improvement of the Process in Ecclesiastical Courts.....		213
"	Paper by Sir R. Phillimore, D.C.L., Q.C.	214
"	Discussion—Mr. A. J. Stephens, L.L.D., Q.C.	219
Diocesan Synods in Relation to Convocation and Parliament		222
"	Paper by the Rev. Archdeacon Bickersteth	222
"	Paper by the Rev. Canon Trevor.....	229
"	Discussion—Dean of York	236
"	" Mr. Beresford Hope, M.P.	238
"	" Bishop of Illinois	239
Best mode of attaching the People to the Church of England		241
"	Paper by the Dean of Carlisle	241
"	Paper by the Rev. Erskine Clark.....	247
"	Discussion—Rev. R. Gregory	254
"	" Mr. Powell, M.P.....	255
"	" Mr. C. Longhurst Higgins	257
"	" Rev. E. A. Hillyard.....	258
"	" Rev. Robert W. Kennion	259
"	" Rev C. F. Lowder	252
Church Rates		260
"	Speech by Colonel Akroyd, M.P. (The Chairman)	260
"	Paper by Archdeacon Denison.....	260
"	Paper by the Rev. F. Master White	273
"	Discussion—Mr. J. M. Clabon	280
"	" Mr. Hubbard, M.P.....	282
"	" Mr. Assheton Crosse	284
"	" Rev. M. W. Mayow	284
"	" Rev. J. M. Du Port	286
"	" Rev. W. R. Clark	288
"	" Rev. J. D. Massingham	289
"	" Mr. W. C. Wilshire.....	290
"	" Rev. J. Faxley	291
"	" Mr. Henry Clark	291
"	" Mr. Grayston	291
"	" Mr. Bennett.....	292
State and Prospects of the Churches of Western Europe		292
"	Paper by Archdeacon Churton.....	292
"	Paper by the Rev. Dr. Godfray	300
"	Discussion—Rev. F. Meyrick	314
"	" Earl of Harrowby, K.G.....	315
"	" Rev. F. G. Lee.....	317

	PAGE
Final Meeting	319
English Church Hymnody	322
„ Paper by Sir Roundell Palmer	323
Conclusion	343
Appendix—Rev. Canon Atlay A.,—Stat. 26, Henrici VIII., c. 14	347
„ Earl Nelson A. and B.	350
Correspondence with the North Eastern Railway Company	354
Proposal for Printing future Congress Reports, by Earl Nelson	356
Registered List of Members	357

Rules observed at all Meetings.

1. None but Members of the Church of England and Ireland, or of Churches in Communion with the same, will be permitted to address the Congress, and no person will be allowed to speak twice on the same subject.
2. All questions of order of proceedings are in the discretion of the President, or presiding Chairman, whose decision is final.
3. Any Member desirous of addressing the Congress on the subject before the Meeting shall give his card to the Secretary in attendance, and await the call of the Chairman.
4. Every Speaker shall address the Chair only, and is expected to confine himself strictly to the subject under discussion.
5. No question arising out of any paper or subject treated at any meeting is to be put to the vote.

THE SERMON

BY THE MOST REVEREND

CHARLES THOMAS, LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

THE SERMON.

JUDGES xiii., 23.

“If the LORD were pleased to kill us, He would not have received a burnt-offering and a meat-offering at our hands, neither would He have shewed us all these things.”

SUCH was the language of faith and consolation, with which the wife of Manoah rebuked her husband's groundless fear that they had incurred the wrath of the LORD Jehovah. Events, which should have suggested hopeful encouragement, were by him regarded but as tokens of Divine displeasure. It was in vain that the angel of the Lord had promised that the barren woman should become a joyful mother;—that the son she was to bear should be consecrated to God from the womb, and one day appear as the deliverer of Israel from the hands of the Philistines. The minute instructions given by Divine command as to the ordering of the child;—the gracious acceptance of an offering at their hands;—and other marks of the favour of Heaven,—were all unheeded; the sentence of death, as he believed, must have passed upon them both; for they had seen God, and there shall no man see His face and live. Such indeed might well have been the issue of this appearance, had the LORD Jehovah manifested Himself to mortal eye in the ineffable brightness of His glory. But that glory was veiled under the angelic form, in condescension to mortal weakness; and they were spared the fatal shock of that overwhelming vision “which eye hath not seen, neither hath it entered into the heart of man to conceive.” So however it came to pass, that what was meant in mercy was misconstrued as the forerunner of destruction:—another instance this of man's infirmity and blindness to the ways of Providence, often leading him to view with dismay events that he at last looks back upon with devout thankfulness, as the source of unlooked for blessings. “All these things are against me,” was the desponding cry of the Father of the Patriarchs, when the cherished son of his old age was torn from his reluctant

embrace: all unconscious as he was, that in that very parting were bound up the elements of his own immediate relief and comfort, and of the future greatness and glory of his descendants.

This train of thought has been suggested by the circumstances under which we meet here to-day. We are assembled in solemn Congress, the clergy and laity of our Church combined, to confer upon matters touching its welfare, and devise plans for giving greater effect (under the Divine blessing upon our labours) to its operations in its several branches. We have gathered ourselves together from various parts of the kingdom, to promote the interchange of thought, and engage in temperate but earnest discussion on subjects of practical utility; avoiding all topics of theological controversy, which may find their fitting occasion elsewhere, but in an association constituted as ours is, could hardly minister to godly edifying. May that Blessed SPIRIT, who used to preside over and direct the councils of the Apostles of old, be now with us in our efforts to promote the advancement of the kingdom of God, and the welfare of His Church!

Now those who have been seriously turning their thoughts to the work that lies before us, can scarcely fail to have reflected upon the present prospects and condition of our own Church. To him whose temperament prompts him to take a gloomy view, there may seem to be scope enough here for the indulgence of his moody vein of thought. On the one hand he will see a powerful phalanx arranged in active hostility to all those distinctive elements that characterize it as an Establishment:—such as the legal claim to contributions for the support of the fabric of our churches, and the due maintenance of her services; the presence of the prelates of our Church in the Upper House of Parliament, and their share in the legislature of the country. He will mark their ulterior aim of confiscating our endowments either for the use of the State, or to be shared proportionally among the several denominations of Christians; their resolve to put an end to the exclusive use of her buildings for public worship in conformity with her doctrine and discipline, so that they shall become the common property of every religious body. All these, however, are but accidents, and not of the essence of the Church.

Casting his eyes in another direction, he will see in some quarters a growing aversion to all dogmatic Theology, threatening to eliminate from our formularies each of our distinctive tenets; and beyond this, he will discern a subtle and refined form of unbelief, which eschews the coarser features that were stamped on the infidelity of the last century, combined with a strenuous effort to sanction the maintenance, by persons holding office in our Church, of opinions subversive of the Faith once delivered to the saints.

And besides all this, there is the indomitable perseverance of the Church of Rome and her emissaries, ever on the watch to creep into houses and lead captive the weak and the wavering, who have never been taught the solid foundation on which the Reformed Church of England rests;—ever ready to profit by our unhappy divisions, which must grieve the hearts of those who love the Lord, and who know how want of unity must wound the spirit of Him who prayed the Father that he would keep those whom He had given Him, so that they might be one, as He is one with the Father.

“All these things are against us,” will be the cry of the desponding. But are there not also many things which God hath shewed us,—such abundant manifestations of His loving-kindness towards us as we can never believe He would have exhibited, had He foreordained us to destruction? Are there not offerings that He has accepted at our hands, that He would never have welcomed from those from whom He had withdrawn His countenance, and whose doom was sealed? All of which it would be thankless in us not to regard, as so many tokens of His abiding favour.

And as to divisions, however much we may lament them, it may still well be asked at what period of the Church have they not more or less prevailed? Brief indeed was the æra when all those who believed were of one heart and of one mind. Strifes and divisions, as we know, soon marred that peace, through the waywardness of self-will; but all this did not prevent the Church from going forth, conquering and to conquer, in the might of Him who subdueth all things unto Himself. And as an instance of this victorious march of the Gospel of Christ, in spite of any divisions that might have existed, and in evidence of the favour with which the Lord hath regarded us, let us mark what God hath wrought for our Church since it was first

planted in this our island. How little could that Apostle or Missionary, whoever he might be, that first brought the glad tidings of salvation to our shores, forecast the future destiny of the Church he was then the instrument of founding ! How little did he imagine that the grain of mustard seed, then sowed by him, would one day become the greatest of herbs, so that the birds of the air from every quarter would come and lodge in its branches ! that the sun should never set upon the congregations in communion with her ; that she should have the heathen for her spiritual inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for her spiritual dominion ! And yet such have been the tokens of the Lord's favour and loving-kindness towards us, however unworthy we may have been of the least of all His mercies ; He has accepted our prayers and our offerings ; He has blessed our labours, and acknowledged our sacrifices to make His saving health known unto all nations. He has permitted us to be His chief instruments in carrying out His gracious purpose that the Gospel should be preached to all the world, yea to every kindred tongue and people that dwell upon the earth, and in translating the word of God into almost every language under heaven, so that its offer of pardon through the atoning blood of Christ should be borne to all the world for a witness.

But that we might the better execute this great Commission, He first enabled us to remove the dominion of a foreign ecclesiastical power, and purify ourselves from the corruptions with which, through that pernicious influence, the doctrine and worship of our Church had been infected, so that we might be the heralds of a pure and unadulterated gospel. That Missionary spirit, with which the primitive Church was so deeply penetrated, still breathes freely within our own ; that love for souls which is the distinguishing mark of the Christian character and of the Christian faith still burns fervently, and our labours of love bring forth their fruit in due season. And what if there be a momentary check in one distant field of our Missionary work, where unreasonable men, invested with authority by the Church, abuse the same to the depravation of sound doctrine and the disparagement of our Liturgy ? The Church of Christ has from time to time been exposed to the like assaults from within, and has triumphed over them all.

These recent attacks have put our Church upon her trial, to test her faith, and the sincerity of her devotion to primitive truth. They have called forth expressions of the most cordial sympathy with us, in our day of trouble, from our daughter Churches in the Colonies, as well as from the great and increasing Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America. Nay more, they have elicited the like manifestations from Protestants and Nonconformists both at home and abroad, all bent on supporting us in the resolute stand we take in vindication of the great fundamental truths of Christianity. Here surely are arguments for great encouragement and thankfulness.

Nor should we hesitate to regard the encreased zeal and energy of a large body of the Clergy of our Church, in spite of all our shortcomings and defects; the deeper reverence and devotion with which her Services are administered, the more frequent Communions, and the larger Congregations, the Institutions of Charity and works of Charity, which the last age never witnessed, as substantial proofs that the LORD is indeed with us. That an earnest Ministry is the characteristic of our Church, in the present day, has been witnessed by one, who, though dissentient from our discipline, and ministering himself beyond its pale, could not in fairness withhold this testimony to our progress.¹ Whence, then, this marked revival, but from the mighty working of the Blessed SPIRIT within us—from our increased sense of responsibility, from the abiding remembrance to how weighty an office we are called, how great a treasure is committed to our charge as messengers, watchmen, and stewards of the Lord, as ministering to the Spouse and Body of Christ.

Nor, in such a review, can the religious revival among the Laity of our Church fail to be recognized. Let the unprecedented multiplication of Churches, throughout the length and breadth of the land,—chiefly through their countenance and aid,—and the costly restoration of those which by the neglect of generations had become unworthy of the name of Temples of the living God, tell of their conscientious liberality in the cause of Christ; of which, as manifested in the two dioceses of this County, no one can speak with more grateful acknowledgements than myself. Then again, we may observe, the general solicitude to have

(1) An earnest ministry the want of the times.—Angel James.

resident Pastors, and the sacrifices the more wealthy are willing to make to secure this boon, where it does not already exist, for themselves and the people around them; the care for the children of their poorer neighbours, and their contributions to provide for them an education according to the doctrine of our Church. Nor, if we venture to penetrate the privacy of their own houses, shall we have less cause to rejoice in the religious advancement on the part of our Laity. Let any one who can remember the earlier part of this century ask himself whether he does not believe that the households in which the daily sacrifice of prayer and praise is offered up in family worship, have multiplied ten-fold since that period. When that illustrious Queen, the nursing mother of the Church in her far-distant island-home, was asked what struck her most during her stay among us, her reply was this—"The all but universal habit, wherever I have been received as a guest, of assembling the household for the daily offering of united worship."

Time would fail me to dwell upon the revival of Convocation in both Provinces, after it had been in abeyance for more than a century, and its action in framing two new Canons affecting Clerical Subscription, or the assembling of Congresses such as this, in proof of the encreased energy of the Church. All this surely proves that we wish to inspire our Institutions with renewed life and vigour, amending what is amiss, and rendering them more worthy of Him in whose honour they are established. Yet, whatever advances we may have been permitted to make under the blessing of Him who is Lord of all, there is still very ample room for progress. There is the pressing demand for a still further encrease of the Episcopate, as well as for a large addition to our means of ministering to the wants of our rapidly encreasing population. There is the question of Lay agency, and of the best mode of availing ourselves of that assistance. There are our Foreign Missions, and the means of providing Missionary Candidates, as well as a more efficient system of training for those who are destined for the Ministry at home: all these subjects deserve and will doubtless receive, here and elsewhere, the greatest consideration. It is well that our Congress has travelled thus far North this year; and I hope it may soon appear

again in one or other of the great centres of population in this Country, encouraging those who are already within the fold of our Church to renewed activity in the cause of our Divine Master, and proving to such as are yet in non-conformity that we have, of very truth, the welfare of souls at heart, and are bent upon carrying the Glad Tidings of Gospel Truth and Mercy to every home and heart within our reach, so that its bright beams may penetrate all the dark corners of the land.

While therefore we see much reason for thankfulness in the review of the past,—much for encouragement and hope as regards the future,—from the marked revival that has been seen in our Church within the last seventy years, we must not blind ourselves to the fact, that there is a more serious assault upon the truths of Revelation in these our days than has ever before been made. It is advanced in the cause of truth, as its advocates maintain, and in the search after truth. But this their search lacks that one element, without which the pursuit of Divine Truth, at least, must ever be in vain;—I mean the consciousness of inability to discover it without the aid of the SPIRIT of Truth. That SPIRIT must be invoked before either the intellect or the heart of man can be enlightened to discover the deep things of God; for “the things of God knoweth no man, but the SPIRIT of God.” And this is the reason why all other attempts to regenerate fallen man, and redress by human means alone the wrong that has been done to our nature, have been, and ever will be, futile. Man was for ages labouring to create a religion for himself; but all in vain, till God came to his relief, and taught him what he had been long fruitlessly feeling after in the dark.

The schools of philosophy, in days of yore, sought to solve the various problems of man’s complex being, moral intellectual and spiritual, but failed in every effort. Nor will those of our own day, the Metaphysical, the Positive, the Material, schools fare the better. Within their own province they may continue to advance, but they will never master the mysteries of our being, nor satisfy the instincts and the cravings of man. There needs more than the cup of philosophy to slake the thirst of an immortal soul. They will all, as the creation of man, perish when time is no more, but the Church of the Living God, and the

Word of the Living God, the Pillar of truth and the Oracle of truth, these alone shall endure. Those systems will share the fate of the mightiest empires of the world. "My empire," said the gréatest conqueror of this age, or of many past centuries, when reviewing in his exile the history of his past fortunes, "my empire, and those of other great conquerors, Alexander the Great, Cæsar, Charlemagne, were all founded on fear, and all have perished. There was one only based on Love, that of the great Author of Christianity, and that alone continues, and will endure."

Love, as he perceived, is the only moving power which can raise humanity above itself, and that love must be shed abroad in our hearts by the HOLY GHOST. It is the love of souls, inspired from above and aided from above,—an element unknown in all previous religions ;—it is the constraining love of CHRIST, through the operation of the HOLY GHOST, which is the great secret of winning souls, and restoring in the heart of man the lost image of God. It is the doctrine of the Cross, with the blessed truths of which it is the great centre, that have achieved this victory, first over the civilized and then over the savage races of mankind. Rob Christianity of those high doctrines on which the world would fain pour its scorn, and the salt has lost its savour : it has no longer power to purify the heart, or leaven the heathen nations with any sanctifying influence.

As to the inability of these systems of philosophy, of man's creation, to touch the finest chords in the heart of man, to develope into action its noblest latent principles, let us hear the frank confession of one of these teachers. It is this—that the tendency of every system which excludes all reference to religion, and is based upon utility or abstract reasoning alone, tends to chill all enthusiasm and elevated self-devotion to the good of others. "Our age," says he, "exhibits a marked decline in the spirit of self-sacrifice ; in the appreciation of the more religious aspect of our nature. The history of self-sacrifice during the last eighteen hundred years has been mainly the history of the action of Christianity upon the world." "It is the enlarged conceptions and persuasive power of the Christian Faith that have chiefly called it (the spirit of self-sacrifice) into being, and it is by their influence alone that it can be permanently sustained."¹ And he adds,

(1) Leckie, Vol. II., pp. 405, 409.

“When we look at that joyous devotion with which men of yore sacrificed to their Faith their material interests; when we consider the perfect confidence and security for their souls which was the recompense of that sacrifice, it is impossible to deny that we have lost something in our boasted progress of civilization.” Such is his candid acknowledgement, and this is the dark cloud which they themselves feel to be overshadowing what they would otherwise deem the bright prospects of Rationalism, and its kindred schemes for the renovation of human nature.

There is, however, another system that does not make so bold a venture as these would invite us to risk, but which advocates the adoption of a code of Christian Rationalism. The leading principle of this creed is, that nothing shall be embraced by faith which reason cannot comprehend: the balance being thus fairly struck, as they fancy, between the spiritual and intellectual faculties of man, so that, as its disciples would fain lead us to believe, all difficulties are thus solved. Far otherwise indeed! For some of its disciples have very reasonably doubted whether in good truth this rational Christianity, in its vain effort to become more Christian and more religious than the Bible, is any Religion at all; whether, after this exhaustive process has been worked out, and every thing eliminated which does not commend itself to man’s reason, the residuum does indeed deserve that name; whether, when Christianity has been reduced to this dead level, it will have any virtue as regards those great purposes of mercy for which it was brought into the world. It then becomes closely allied to Deism; and when this inexorable reason, and this remorseless criticism of which they boast, shall have banished the supernatural as contrary to experience, and all dogma as irrational;—when there is no longer any authority to which man can appeal, save his own individual conscience,—what is this after all but to make a God of conscience, God himself being nothing more than human reason and human conscience personified? It may confidently be affirmed that in rejecting all positive Revelation and fixed Doctrine, and compelling the religious instinct in man to be fed and supported by its own inherent virtue, the so-called Christian Rationalism gives a mortal blow to Religion itself. It renders it unfit for the general guidance of man, as a complex being made up of body

soul and spirit, neither of which elements can be ignored if you would provide for his welfare and happiness even in this world. "The heart has its reasons," I use the language of Pascal, "the heart has its reasons, of which Reason knows nothing,"¹ and it is no mark of true philosophy to refuse to entertain these, and to think of constructing a system for the moral and social improvement of man, without taking them into account.

I have thus briefly glanced at the trials which await us, while I have pointed to those manifest tokens of Divine favour in the past, which we humbly trust are an earnest of the like support for the future. But while we rejoice in these evidences of the loving-kindness of the LORD, let us rejoice with trembling. Let us examine ourselves and our condition as in the sight of Him who trieth the reins and the heart;² and remembering the awful warnings given to the seven churches of Asia, and the fate that has befallen them, may we all, as Ministers and Members of one branch of Christ's Holy Catholick Church, note what is yet lacking; may we be "watchful and strengthen the things that remain!" God forbid that we should say we "have need of nothing"; the surest proof that we in truth are wanting in all things. Doubtless the Lord has a "few things against us" as a Church; and may it be our earnest endeavour and our constant prayer that we may perfect that which is wanting; may advance in grace and godliness; and, holding fast the truth as it is in Jesus, be able to overcome all the adversaries of our Faith. Let us shun, as the very canker of our souls, all taint of worldliness, all indifference to gospel truth, all self-complacency by reason of our present attainments, but be ever pressing towards a higher mark, that we may stand perfect and complete in all the will of God!

The struggle between good and evil is certainly becoming more and more vehement; the conflict between Truth and Unbelief more and more distinct: but all this, and especially the bold and unblushing denial of the value and power of Prayer, are in exact conformity with what we are led to expect in the latter days. For, "When the Lord cometh, shall He find faith in the earth?" Solemn indeed are the thoughts thus suggested; but at the same time they are fraught with

(1) P. Pascal, Ed. Faugere. Vol. II., p. 172.

(2) Rev. ii. 23, cf. Ps. vii. 9, Jer. xi. 20, &c.

bright and animating hopes. The more intense the conflict between good and evil, between belief and unbelief, the more gloomy our prospect for the moment may become, the more plainly are we taught to discern the signs of the times, and to believe that our Redemption draweth nigh. That night of darkness will be the sure harbinger of a glorious morning whose Sun shall never set. May these palpable signs serve to deepen our convictions of Divine Truth, quicken our love to the Saviour, and make us lean with more entire confidence on Him in whom we believe.

Thus shall we, as individuals and as a Church, be made more meet for the inheritance of the saints in light; and washed in the blood of the Lamb, be ready to meet the Bridegroom when He comes, to follow Him with the train of the redeemed, and enter upon our eternal rest in the joy of our Lord! “Even so, LORD JESUS, come quickly”!!!

YORK CHURCH CONGRESS.

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 9th.

His Grace the ARCHBISHOP of YORK took the Chair at 2-30 p.m., in the CONGRESS HALL, supported by His Grace the ARCHBISHOP of CANTERBURY, the BISHOP PRIMUS of SCOTLAND, and a large array of PRELATES, DIGNITARIES, NOBLEMEN, and others.

The PRESIDENT opened the proceedings with Prayer.

Lord have mercy, &c.
Christ have mercy, &c.
Lord have mercy, &c.

Our Father, which art in heaven, Hallowed be Thy Name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, As it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses, As we forgive them that trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation: But deliver us from evil, For Thine is the kingdom, The Power, and the glory, For ever and ever. Amen.

O LORD, we beseech thee mercifully to receive the prayers of thy people which call upon thee; and grant that they may both perceive and know what things they ought to do, and also may have grace and power faithfully to fulfil the same; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

ALMIGHTY and everlasting God, by whose Spirit the whole body of the Church is governed and sanctified; Receive our supplications and prayers, which we offer before thee for all estates of men in thy holy Church, that every member of the same, in his vocation and ministry, may truly and godly serve thee; through our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Amen.

His GRACE then spoke as follows:—

My Lord Archbishop, my Lords, Ladies, and Gentlemen,—In opening the proceedings of this Congress my first duty is a most pleasant one,—to offer a hearty welcome, on the part of this ancient city, to all the prelates, clergy, and laity who have assembled here for the discussion of Church affairs. York perhaps is less able than some other towns of more modern growth to accommodate large numbers of visitors; but she is not likely to allow this meeting to detract from that reputation for hospitality which she has long enjoyed. It was not until we were fairly committed to the present Congress that we discovered that there was not a room in this city capable of holding the number of members that have taken part in former Congresses. I ought to apologise for this homely wooden building which has been erected in consequence; and it certainly has but slight architectural pretensions. But when I remember that it has been constructed in six weeks, that every one of the two thousand five hundred auditors can see the speaker of the time, and that the nimble hands of many volunteers have furnished the decorations of it, I confess that I am rather disposed to congratulate the meeting upon the difficulty being so promptly overcome, and to thank the builders and all who have assisted in preparing this hall for our use.

Let our heartiest welcome be given to those who represent the American Church at this Congress. We have felt for them in the struggle that has convulsed their country. We feel for them in the desolation it has left behind it. There is, no doubt, a feeling of bitterness against us on the part of the American people, which we do not reciprocate. If New York looks askance at us, old York has no jealousy of her thriving name-child. We heartily wish that the work of reparation may go rapidly on, and that ruined churches may be re-built and pastors reinstated and congregations gathered again. The two peoples are akin, the two Churches are sisters. We rejoice that America has sent us representatives so distinguished.¹

My next duty is equally agreeable. We have heard this morning in the Minster an earnest, loving, and impressive discourse from his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury. The most rev. prelate was connected for a short time with the see of York, but his connection with the diocese, and with Yorkshire, was as long as the working life of many men. He was called in God's providence to organise a new diocese, including the more populous half of this county; and his work in the diocese of Ripon will be had in affectionate remembrance long after this generation shall have passed away. I shall assume the permission of this meeting to offer him our cordial thanks for his excellent discourse, and to express our wish that he may long be spared to us in health and vigour, and may be endued with wisdom from above for the high functions which have been assigned to him.

Let me next bespeak the kind indulgence of the Congress for the arrangements that have been made by the Executive Committee. The

(1) The American Bishops present were the Right Rev. Henry John Whitehouse, Bishop of Illinois; the Right Rev. Thomas Atkinson, Bishop of North Carolina; and the Right Rev. William Bacon Stevens, Bishop of Pennsylvania.

difficulties in arranging the programme of a meeting of this kind are very great. Subjects in which some proposer takes a great interest must be put aside for others of greater claims. The whole class of charitable societies must be resisted, not from hardness of heart, but from the reflection that if they were admitted there would be no room for anything else, and the Congress would become an October version of the May meetings. Some questions of great interest had been already discussed so thoroughly at two, or even three, previous Congresses, that it was inexpedient to revive them at present. For other questions it was difficult to provide papers and speakers. A mistaken notion has been taken up, that a Church Congress is a meeting in which every one has a right to read a paper or to speak upon any subject, provided he gives notice of his intention. A Church Congress upon these terms would be impossible.

The whole number of hours of debate, of all the Sections, does not exceed the length of one important debate in the House of Commons; and unless the committee were to husband the time of the Congress carefully, many subjects would be overlaid and lost. In one instance complaint has been made that a paper was refused from some objection to the writer's opinions; but for this there is not the slightest ground. The committee has aimed rather at securing that all opinions should be well represented, in order that each discussion may be as complete as possible. The principle on which this committee has proceeded has been already approved at other similar meetings. Of the three hours generally given to a debate, the committee takes possession of one hour and ten minutes, within which it secures a hearing to two readers of papers and two speakers, who are chosen for their knowledge of and interest in the subject. The remaining time is to be divided by the chairman according to the best of his ability, among the members who propose themselves as speakers. No one has been rejected on the ground that his opinions are different from those of the majority of the committee; no one will be hindered who may offer himself as a speaker by the fact that his views may not coincide with those of the chairman of the day. There is every wish on all sides that the subjects finally selected may receive the most ample and candid examination.

Complaints have been made here and there that one question or another has been passed over that ought to have found a place. It is quite possible that the committee may have erred in their choice. But, as the time is so short, such complaints ought to show in addition what subjects in the present programme ought to have been supplanted. It would be difficult to find one of them which is not worthy of the attention of a body like this. Three of the subjects refer to the law and constitution of the Church of England; four to her use of the instruments already available in the diocesan and parochial system, and in the aid of laymen and women; six to the means of raising the religious feeling of the people, by preaching, hymnology, education, the observance of the Lord's Day, and by improving their social state, and providing innocent recreation for them and attaching them to the Church of England; two have reference to our Missions and to foreign Churches. A programme like this appears to be rather chargeable with over-fulness than with meagreness and omissions.

To make an end of complaints against us, I will add that the least reasonable of all is that which charges the committee with omitting to secure lay co-operation for the debates. The answer is, that at no former Congress have there been so many lay speakers; that in the first debate the subject of the Lord's Day will be worthily handled by a Lord Chancellor of Ireland; and that the Congress will be dissolved by a paper on hymnology from an Attorney-General, whose well-known work on that subject has become a household companion.

In short, it may be fairly claimed for the committee that they have done their best to secure for the Congress a programme as complete and as instructive as they could. Upon any defects or errors they hope for the indulgent construction of the Congress.

In order that each discussion may be fearlessly and candidly conducted, I would bespeak a fair hearing for every speaker; even from those who may the most strongly dissent from his expressed opinions. Any speaker who is so unfortunate as to find his opinions shared by a very small minority of those present should be brought to a better mind, not by interruptions and cries of disapproval, which have a hardening effect upon the heart, but by the surer means of subsequent argument and persuasion. I rely in this matter upon the general support of the Congress. Free discussion is better understood in England than in any other country; she has been trained to it for centuries. But Congresses are only six years old; and perhaps this may be the reason that the toleration and self-restraint which are essential for free discussion have not yet become habitual. At Norwich last year the quick ear of the right rev. President detected among the sounds of disapproval in the first debate, what I will call after Lord Bacon "a sweet degree of sibilation or purling;" which, however, was promptly repressed. At York we will hope to dispense with that mode of expressing emotion. Where men feel deeply, they are naturally apt to give utterance to their feeling. But the sure effect of such expressions is to stifle freedom of debate, and to make the side of the minority a position of danger. There will, I trust and believe, be no such drawback to the present Congress.

It is essential that the rule as to the length of papers and speeches should be exactly construed. Every minute added in one quarter is subtracted from another; and there is a hardship in depriving some one who has come from a distance perhaps to express his opinion, of an opportunity of speaking, because the time he might have had has been lost by a lax observance of the rule by former speakers.

It is far from my purpose to anticipate any of the subjects that are presently to engage our attention. Let me rather speak of the uses of a Church Congress like the present, apart from the functions of the two Convocations. The Congress does not pretend to enact or resolve or petition; it discusses and examines subjects of prominent interest, and assists to form the public opinion about them. It plays the same part with regard to ecclesiastical questions which one Society does towards physical inquiry and another towards social science. Of all such associations, where discussion rather than action is the immediate object, it is often said that they are barren of results. But this is not truly said. Wherever a mature public opinion suggests a course of action, the action will presently be taken. True words spoken here

may set chords vibrating in many breasts; and the vibration may meet its next response in the parishes to which we go back at this week's end. We shall speak of the school and the sermon, of the duty of the Church towards masses of the population that seem in their growth to outstrip her attempts to reach them. We shall speak of the layman's duty; of the woman's gentler power, which has never been wanting since Mary and Joanna and the rest ministered to Him visible in Galilee. We shall discuss the poor man's social hindrances in a sympathising spirit. Words earnestly uttered by men that are in earnest on subjects such as these do not fall to the ground. We shall go back to find a fresh life infused into the tame and trite routine of our duty. The task of teaching from a town pulpit, for example, a congregation full of modern ideas, thoughts, doubts, may become to some of us infinitely larger, more solemn, more absorbing than we took it to be; no longer to be dealt with by a happy knack of reproducing the sermons of the last generation in a more succinct and modern garb, but rather the supreme task of a mind rich in things new and old, and able to claim the confidence of its hearers by showing itself a leader of their thoughts, better informed than they about the modern spirit, and able to help their strife because it has striven too. Again, some who stand aloof from great social questions because they do not see their own particular duty there may find here a suggestion of duty from some remark made in these debates. A teeming population, in great part untaught, without worship, without aspirations after better things, adjusting its wages by the rude and wasteful machinery of strikes, depressed by overcrowding and unhealthy trades, and arresting the depression by too much drink, the first prey to every epidemic, the first to suffer from a stagnation of commerce, ready to listen if we know how to speak, ready as all human hearts have been to answer to the reproof of the Gospel against sin,—this great population, fainting and scattered abroad as sheep having no shepherd, and yet bound to us by their great need, by our abundant opportunities,—how shall we reach them? “The harvest truly is plenteous.”

Questions like these are ready for discussion, but not for formal enactments and resolutions. If the hands of Convocation were free, as they ought to be, there would be work for it to do in revising our obsolete canons, and in making new ones, such as should be adapted to the wants of the present time. At present, its proper work of legislation being superseded, it is almost forced to do what does not belong to it. With its present constitution it can hardly guide, for it does not fully represent, the public opinion of the Church. And I must here confess, with much diffidence, the opinion that in assuming the power to try and condemn books, Convocation runs a risk of infringing the liberties of the clergy as they are secured by law; and that, however great the demerits of a book, however desirable that an authoritative opinion should be pronounced against it, still the law which has appointed one mode of proceeding and one only for ecclesiastical offences is most important to the clergy. If the present process is defective, let it be improved, rather than that the legislative body should supply judicial defects by assuming the office of a judge. The judicial functions which, under the head of breach of “privilege,” belong to Parliament

are great, but they are hardly ever exercised. Opinion leans more and more towards purely judicial decision, and is more and more averse from decisions come to by the majority of a large assembly, perhaps after a hot and passionate debate.

The assistance of laymen in the Congress gives it a great advantage in informing public opinion. It is to be regretted that there is so much reluctance on the part of laymen to take part in religious discussions. They underrate their own knowledge; they are not sufficiently convinced of our wish to gain their counsel. But whenever the legislative body of the Church is reconstituted, the experience of the Church Congress on this subject is not likely to be forgotten.

The Church of Christ is now passing through a trial, severe although bloodless, in this and other countries. Every tenet of our religion will be searched and sifted. Already criticism has been busy, not about subordinate questions, but about the person of the Lord, and the nature of His revelation, and the future life of the soul. Will faith at last triumph over doubt? I firmly believe it. But all the facts of the struggle impose upon us a great responsibility meanwhile. If we could see the number and force of the foes without, it would tend more to peace within the Church than many exhortations.

Those poorer classes whose interests we are to consider are plied with literature wherein the question is not between this mode of worship and that, but whether man does, or does not, die wholly when he dies, like the brutes, and whether he does well or not in taking all the pleasure he can get before the day when he is nothing. In the face of these great dangers we do well to be in earnest, to draw together rather than to be scattered, to be sure of the grounds of all that we advance. Our deliberations here are but a small part of that spiritual warfare which will probably outlast this generation. But you will join me in the prayer that wisdom and love may guide all our deliberations, and that, if our heart burn within us, it may be with love of Christ and of His scattered sheep, and not with the fire of strife. Refreshed with converse with others, like-minded seekers of the same ends as we, may we all, whether clergymen or laymen, go back to our work with larger aims, with a firmer trust, with deeper peace. Though the waters rage and swell, and though the mountains shake, the Church of God has its foundations deeper than the roots of the mountains. And God will bear witness to Himself, though some deny him, to the end; and men will feel that sin is ruin and death; and the sweet voice of the Redeemer will be heard above the noise of many waters, declaring to the lost and wretched the way of life.

His Grace then requested the following Vice-Presidents to act as Chairmen of the several Sections:—

The Right Honourable the Lord Mayor of York; the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Oxford; the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Ripon; the Right Honourable the Lord Feversham; the Honourable and Very Rev the Dean of York; Colonel Akroyd, M.P.

The President said the first subject for consideration was the Obligation and due Observance of the Lord's Day, on which a paper would be read by the Lord Bishop of Ripon, being the first time that any English Bishop had so favoured the Church Congress.

OBLIGATION AND DUE OBSERVANCE OF THE LORD'S DAY.

THE LORD BISHOP OF RIPON READ THE FOLLOWING PAPER:—

THE question to be discussed is the Obligation and due Observance of the Lord's Day. The two points which the question embraces are closely connected; the measure and degree of observance due to the Christian Sunday must mainly be determined by the law of the appointment itself. Hence, the first object is to ascertain by what authority one day in seven has been appointed to be kept holy. This being determined, the way will be clear for considering how the day ought to be observed.

Now, in a matter of this nature, the appeal must, of necessity, be made to the Word of God. 'What saith the Scripture?' is the enquiry which will guide to the only satisfactory resolution of the question how far the institution of the Sabbath is, or is not, of perpetual and universal obligation.

The earliest allusion to the Sabbath in the word of God, is in the second chapter of Genesis. We there read ii. 1—3. "Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them. And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made." This statement has all the appearance of being the first appointment of the Sabbath; but against this view it is argued, that if the institution dates from the rest of God at the close of the six day's work of creation, it is unaccountable that no mention of it occurs in the inspired narrative of the Patriarchal age. For the sake of argument, admit for the moment, that there is no allusion to the Sabbath in the sacred story of Patriarchal times; does it necessarily follow that the Institution did not then exist? The scriptural narrative of that period is brief and fragmentary; the history of centuries is condensed into a few sentences; it is too much to expect that every ordinance, even of divine origin, should be specifically mentioned in so short a narrative. In subsequent portions of the inspired volume there are omissions to the full as important as this supposed omission with respect to the Sabbath. The ordinance of circumcision for example was a standing ordinance of the Abrahamic Covenant; but not a single instance of its observance is recorded during a period of at least fifteen centuries from the time of the settlement in Canaan to the first advent of Christ. No one argues, from the silence of the sacred writers as to circumcision during that long interval, that the rite was unknown or unobserved, and surely the absence of any express mention of the Sabbath during the Patriarchal Age is not a proof that the Institution had no existence. No allusion is made to the Sabbath in the books of Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Samuel, or the first book of Kings, even though confessedly the ordinance was binding upon the nation of Israel at the period of which those books contain the history. Is it then a matter for surprise that in the comparatively brief and cursory

narrative of the Patriarchal age, the institution of the Sabbath should be apparently overlooked?

Incidental notices, however, are not wanting, from which we may infer the existence of the Sabbath in the ages which preceded the call of Israel.

There is evidence, amounting almost to demonstration, in proof of the sub-division of time from the beginning into periods of weeks. In the books of Moses the allusions are frequent. There is, for example, the expression "in process of time" or at the "end of days" Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering to the Lord; an expression which has been taken to intimate that even in these days there were set seasons for the solemnities of divine worship. Again, there is the account of Noah three times in succession opening the windows of the Ark, to discern if the waters were abated: in each case at the expiration of seven days. To this may be added the saying of Laban to Jacob with regard to Leah "fulfil her week and we will give thee this also;" and the narrative of the mourning of Joseph and his brethren for their father, "seven days." These, and many other incidental notices of a similar kind, imply the computation of time by periods of seven days; nor is there wanting evidence from uninspired sources to prove the universality as well as the antiquity of this method of reckoning time. But how is this fact to be explained if not by reference to some direct divine appointment? The computation of time by days, months and years, arises evidently from natural causes; the subdivision of time into periods of seven days has no foundation in any of the phenomena of nature; but it is easy of explanation upon the supposition of the existence from the earliest times of the weekly Sabbath.

It has been contended, however, that the first institution of the Sabbath dates from the giving of the manna, as recorded in Exodus, xvi. One thing is clear, if the Sabbath was not then appointed for the first time, it must have been previously in existence, and in all probability from the time of the Creation. It is important, therefore, to notice carefully what was said with respect to the Sabbath, at the time when the manna was first given. We find, then, in Exodus, chapter xvi. 5. the Lord said, concerning the giving and collecting the manna, "on the sixth day they shall prepare that which they bring in, and it shall be twice as much as they gather daily." This came to pass; and the rulers of the congregation in their surprise came and told Moses. He at once explained the occurrence in the words "this is that which the Lord hath said, To-morrow is the rest of the holy sabbath unto the Lord eat that to-day, for to-day is a sabbath unto the Lord, to-day ye shall not find it in the field; six days ye shall gather it, but on the seventh day, *which is the sabbath*, in it there shall be none" (xvi. 23—25). All this was before the promulgation of the law. The passage, therefore, necessarily involves the pre-existence of the Sabbath if it be not its original appointment.

But with which supposition is the language most consistent, the pre-existence of the ordinance or its first institution? Can we hesitate as to the reply? The manna, which fell upon each of the other six days of the week, did not fall on the seventh. A double quantity fell upon the sixth to obviate the necessity for any gathering

upon the seventh, and what was collected upon the sixth day preserved its sweetness throughout the day following. Moses explained the meaning of this by referring to the Sabbath. It was to mark the distinction between the seventh and the other days of the week, and to guard the sanctity of the divine ordinance of the Sabbath that these regulations respecting the manna were made. Is the language of Moses what we might fairly have expected him to employ had he then for the first time been promulgating the law of the Sabbath? Are we not justified in the conclusion so well expressed by a living author whose words I gladly borrow?—"The absence of the manna proved the presence of the Sabbath, and the preservation of manna through the Sabbath Day, and not through any other day of the week, was a periodical proof from heaven itself of the sanctity of the Sabbath."¹

But it is objected, 'the Sabbath is a Jewish Ordinance peculiar to the Levitical dispensation, and abrogated in common with other ceremonial institutions of the law by the introduction of the Gospel.' Now if the institution of the Sabbath existed (as I think it has been proved that it did) centuries before the call of Israel, then it has certainly a distinctive character of its own, and is not to be confounded with the transitory ordinances of the Judaic economy. "If the divine command," writes Dr. Paley, "was actually delivered at the Creation, it was addressed, no doubt, to the whole human species alike; and continues, unless repealed by some subsequent revelation, binding upon all who come to the knowledge of it."

It is admitted that the ordinance of the Sabbath amongst the Jews was surrounded by peculiarities which were not intended to survive the legal dispensation. To the Jews the Sabbath was a commemoration, not only of the rest of God from Creation, but also of their miraculous deliverance from Egypt. "Remember" said Moses, Deuteronomy v. 15. "that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched out arm: *therefore* the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep holy the Sabbath Day." To the Jews, the Sabbath was a sign of their covenant relationship to God. "It is a sign" said the Lord "between me and the Children of Israel for ever." There were prohibitions moreover with regard to the Sabbath which were binding on the Jews only. Such, for example, as the direction to kindle no fire, and to abstain from gathering sticks on that day. It is allowed that these, and similar restrictions imposed upon the Jew, are not binding on the Christian. They were a part of the ceremonial law, and ceased to be obligatory when that law was repealed. But the grand old institution of the Sabbath itself, which existed for centuries beforehand, retains unimpaired its primitive character and obligation, no more in reality changed by those carnal ordinances, which for a season clustered around it, than the majestic oak is affected by the creeping tendrils which twine around its trunk and branches: you may tear away the creeper, and leave the forest tree in undiminished vigour and glory.

Now it is instructive to notice the various intimations which were afforded even under the Jewish dispensation that the ordinance

24 *Obligation and Due Observance of the Lord's Day.*

of the Sabbath was of wider obligation and intended to be of more extended duration than the other ceremonial institutions. For example; The ceremonies of the law were for the most part typical. They were 'a shadow of things to come.' They were abolished when the Antitype appeared in the person of our Lord. The Sabbath is under one aspect a typical institution: it is a type of the eternal rest which remains for the people of God. But a type continues ever till the antitype appears. The Sabbath being then a type of the eternal rest, the conclusion is self-evident, that the ordinance must remain to the close of the existing dispensation. "ἀρα ἀπολείπεται σαββατισμὸς τῷ λαῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ."—(Heb. iv. 9.)

Again, it was peculiar to the ordinance of the Sabbath, that it was binding upon the stranger no less than the Jew. "In it" so runs the command "thou shalt not do any work *nor the stranger* that is within thy gates." Strangers were not allowed to participate in the other ordinances of Judaism. No stranger might eat the passover, offer incense, or join in the ritual services of the temple, without submitting to the initiatory rite of circumcision. The institution of the Sabbath was, in this respect, a marked exception. The stranger who chanced to be sojourning within the gates of Israel was commanded to observe it. Did not this regulation serve to stamp the ordinance with an impress of universality and of perpetuity?

A similar argument may be derived from the language of prophecy with respect to the Sabbath. Take for example the prediction of Isaiah, chap. lvi. 6—8. "The sons of the stranger, that join themselves to the LORD, to serve him, and to love the name of the LORD, to be his servants, *every one that keepeth the Sabbath* from polluting it, and taketh hold of my covenant; even them will I bring to my holy mountain, and make them joyful in my house of prayer: their burnt offerings and their sacrifices shall be accepted upon mine altar; for mine house shall be called an house of prayer for all nations." The prediction relates to the times of the Gospel, and distinctly tells of the Sabbath as an institution still to be observed.

But by far the most convincing argument in support of the universal and perpetual obligation of the Sabbath, rests on the position which the ordinance occupies amongst the Ten Commandments delivered from Mount Sinai. God was pleased to give Israel a moral and a ceremonial law. The one eternally and universally binding; the other, transitory in its own nature and limited as to its obligation to the Jewish race. The moral law is immutable like its Author. It is the transcript of the Divine mind, the expression in written statutes of the unalterable will of the unchangeable Jehovah. That law is confined to no one nation. It is limited to no one dispensation. That law, Christ came not to destroy but to fulfil.

The ceremonial law, upon the contrary, was imposed exclusively upon the Jews. It was designed for a temporary purpose. It was abrogated when that purpose was accomplished. All the circumstances which accompanied the delivery, served to indicate the contrast between the moral and the ceremonial precepts. The moral law was written by the finger of God, upon tables of stone. It was proclaimed amid the thunderings of Sinai. The sanctity of its enactment was

upheld by the annexation of death as the penalty of disobedience. The ceremonial law was written by Moses, in a book. No such terrors accompanied its proclamation. Its violation was not punished with like severity.

Now, in which code of statutes is the law of the Sabbath found? Not amongst the ceremonial statutes, but in the centre of the decalogue. How is it, if the Sabbath was merely a Jewish ordinance, that the command for its observance is met with, not in the long list of those enactments which were imperative only upon the ancient people, but occupying a prominent place amongst the Ten Commandments which contain the moral law,—the unrepealed statutes which prescribe the duty we owe to God and to our fellow men? With what reason can it be affirmed that, although each of the other Commandments has the weight of a moral precept, this fourth Commandment, standing as it does in the midst of the ten, is to be regarded as an exception to all the rest, taken out of the class of moral precepts, and treated as a ceremonial enactment, of no remaining obligation, now that the ordinances of Judaism have been abolished?

It is objected, however, that if this argument be sound, it proves too much: in other words, “the fourth Commandment must be taken as a whole, or not at all. If taken as a whole, it binds (1) to the observance of the seventh day of the week, and (2) to the absolute cessation from labour of every kind upon that day.” I do not pause to insist on the point—although it is one of too much importance to be altogether neglected,—that our Church clearly sanctions the belief that the law of the Sabbath is a part of the moral law of God; otherwise, wherefore is it repeated every Lord’s Day in our churches, with the same prayer to be said by the people as that which is directed to be used after each of the other Commandments?—But the objection rests, in part, on a fallacy. There is nothing in the fourth Commandment which necessitates the observance of the seventh rather than any other day of the week. The command requires the consecration of the seventh portion of time, *i. e.* one day in every seven to the Lord; but it does not determine which particular day of the seven is to be kept holy. Hence, whether it be the first or the seventh day, provided only every seventh day is hallowed, the fourth Commandment is literally obeyed.

To maintain otherwise would involve the necessity of determining which is in reality the seventh day of the week computed from Creation, or to say the least from the delivery of the law, at Mount Sinai. The impossibility of such a computation is self-evident. Even the Jewish Sabbath was reckoned not from the completion of the six days’ work of creation but from the giving of the manna. There were Jewish festivals respecting which minute instructions were given so as to fix the exact day of their recurrence. Had it been intended that the day of the weekly Sabbath should remain for ever uncharged, some command to that effect would no doubt have been given. The fourth Commandment defines with precision the proportion of time which is to be hallowed; but leaves indefinite the particular day. The principle of the command thus far is therefore equally upheld by the observance, amongst the Jews of the seventh, or amongst Christians of the first, day of the week as a day to be kept holy.

This being admitted, little need be said in vindication of the transference of the Sabbath, under the Christian dispensation, to the first day of the week. The Jews held their Sabbath upon the day which reminded them of the great Passover deliverance. We keep our Christian Sunday—the Lord's Day—upon that day of the week which reminds us of our Lord's resurrection, and of the advent of the Holy Ghost the Comforter. We find in those glorious events a fitting reason for the change of the day, and we follow the practice of the holy apostles who instituted the change at the time, be it remembered, when they were filled with the Holy Ghost.

It only remains for me to notice the objection that, if we are bound to the observance of the Christian Sunday by the fourth Commandment, we are compelled to an entire cessation from every kind of work upon the Lord's Day. But surely the fourth Commandment is not to be interpreted more rigorously under the gospel, than it was under the law. If then any relaxation of the strict letter of the precept was permitted during the Mosaic economy, certainly not less may be claimed under the better covenant of the Gospel. Now, even amongst the Jews, works of necessity and works of mercy were allowed on the Sabbath Day. The Priests in the temple profaned the Sabbath and were blameless. The owner of an ass or an ox, which had fallen into a pit, would pull him out on the Sabbath Day, and not be regarded, as on that account, a transgressor. There were certain limitations then to the rigour of the Commandment, even under that most exacting dispensation; works of necessity and works of mercy were not regarded as an infringement of the Sabbath by the Jew. Nor should they be regarded as such by those whose privilege it is to enjoy the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free.

If the foregoing considerations are of any weight, they tend to the conclusion that the appointment of one day in seven to be kept holy is coeval with Creation. This fact alone, goes a long way towards establishing the universal and perpetual obligation of the Lord's Day. Evidence is not wanting from which a reasonable inference may be drawn, that the ordinance of a weekly Sabbath was not unknown during the Patriarchal times long before the selection of Israel. All that was peculiar to the institution, beneath the Jewish economy, has passed away. The appointment itself, as established at the close of the six days' work of Creation, and incorporated with the moral law proclaimed on Mount Sinai, remains of undiminished obligation. If these conclusions are just, they afford a clear and definite point from which to set forward upon the deeply important and interesting enquiry;—what is the measure of observance which Christians ought to render to the Lord's Day? Upon that enquiry the necessarily limited space allowed for this paper forbids me here to enter.

THE REV. T. E. ESPIN READ THE FOLLOWING PAPER:—

“The first part of our subject—the Obligation of the Lord’s Day—has been so fully handled already, that further treatment of it is quite superfluous. I believe that I shall best consult both the wishes of the audience and the fair and full presentment of the question by confining myself in the present paper to the second part—the Due Observance of the Lord’s Day. I will only remark, as I must in order to indicate the standing-point from which I regard the details now to be touched upon, that I concur generally with the Bishop of Ripon as to the grounds on which religious observance of the day is obligatory. I cannot, as matter of Biblical criticism, see that the texts which allude to the Sabbath in pre-Mosaic times are satisfied by anything else or less than the assumption that each seventh day was consecrated by God Himself from the beginning. I cannot, as matter of argument, regard that as abrogated in the abrogation of the Mosaic law, which existed as God’s ordinance before the Mosaic law, and even under that law was rested on broader grounds than such as can belong to the Jew and his covenant only. I cannot, as matter of Churchmanship, shut my eyes to the fact that the Church places the Ten Commandments side by side with the Creed and the Lord’s Prayer, as belonging to the very first principles of Christian duty in which she will have her catechumens trained; that she has inserted the Decalogue—God’s commandments, not hers—in her Office for the highest act of Christian worship; nor can I conceive how I can keep or break the Fourth Commandment at all, unless it be by the due observance of the Lord’s Day or by the neglect of it.

Parting thus, then, with the topic of Obligation, let us pass on to that of the due Observance of the Lord’s Day. And let me premise that controversy upon this is not peculiar to the Christian Church. The later Jewish Church had, as is well known, overlaid this, as other parts of the Divine law, with a number of glosses and refinements, which, intended originally to preserve and apply its great principles, had ended as casuistry too often does, in making them of none effect, and evaporating their spirit whilst straining after strict obedience amidst endless details to the letter. The definitions and decisions of the Rabbins are not, indeed, deserving of the wholesale ridicule and contempt with which they are commonly treated; but about the Sabbath they do undoubtedly descend to particulars equally petty and vexatious. They were not in a happy vein, certainly, when they permitted a man to wear a plaster on the Sabbath day, but forbade him to replace it if it fell off; when they licensed him to feed his poultry, but not to bestow a grain more than would be eaten, lest it should sprout, and so he be guilty of sowing corn on the Sabbath; when they tolerated catching a flea on the Sabbath, but not killing it—(Heylin, *Hist. of Sabbath*, i. 8.). But amidst a multitude of such absurdities, two points are noteworthy—(1) That with them as with us there was a school of divines—that of Hillel—which upheld more indulgent interpretations of the Sabbath law, as of other parts of the law; whilst their opponents, who were known as the followers of Shammai, much resembled in their tone the advocates of strict and rigid Sunday observance amongst ourselves. (2) That it was nevertheless agreed

amongst Jewish doctors of all schools that the Sabbath was a festival, not a fast : a day of rejoicing, not of mortification ; of social gathering, not of retirement. Hospitality was encouraged, and too commonly passed the bounds of moderation. The Christian Fathers, Augustine, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Cyril of Alexandria, and others, inveigh bitterly against the Jews on this very account ; averring that their rest was but a carnal one ;—that they did not work indeed, but indulged in drunkenness and stuffed themselves with delicacies ;—that they would do better to plough than to dance and frequent the theatre, and so on. ‘Sabbatarian luxury’ (*luxus Sabbatarius*) was indeed a kind of proverb. (Cf. Bingham, *Antiq.*, xx. 2. 4.) From this, which might be drawn out at length, we see that those amongst ourselves who take the stricter line as to Sunday observance cannot properly be termed, as they ignorantly are, Judaisers or Sabbatarians. Whether they be right or whether they be wrong, their ideas of a well-spent Sunday have no sort of resemblance to those of the Jews. The Fathers of the Church, indeed, constantly draw topics of warning from the Jews, and call on Christians not to pass their Sundays and holydays in the vanity, folly, and excess, which marked the Jewish Sabbath. Yet the Jew was no doubt right in his general principle. The Sabbath was designed as a festival. The key-note for the due observance alike of the Jewish Sabbath and the Lord’s Day is in the words, ‘This is the day which the LORD hath made ; we will rejoice and be glad in it.’ The regulations in the Mosaic law—*e.g.*, that prohibiting cooking, and even the lighting of a fire in the dwelling-house (Ex. xxxv. 3) on the Sabbath—were not designed certainly to enforce asceticism or a spare diet on the day, nor had they that effect. The Sabbath lasted from sunset to sunset : the principal meal was in the evening of each day ; and on the first eve was so prepared that the company might sit down to it just as the Sabbath began, as our Lord probably went to the house of the Pharisee ‘to eat bread on the Sabbath day’ (St. Luke xiv), where the context shows that it was a large gathering. The object of these rules was evidently to protect the servants ; it was, ‘that thy manservant and thy maidservant may rest as well as thou’—a most important principle, of manifold application throughout the whole of our subject.

Another no less important and fruitful principle is the cessation of that weekly toil by which, in the sweat of his face, man is appointed to win his bread. ‘Six days shalt thou labour and do all thy work ; but the seventh day is the Sabbath (or rest) of the LORD thy God.’ Ex. xx. 9. 10. The phraseology of the commandment itself has been rightly noted by divines as significant. The two words, ‘labour’ and ‘work,’ round which its prohibition revolve, mean strictly and properly *servile work* and *gainful business* ; these two, if we give heed to the Fourth Commandment, must on the holy day cease as far as practicable. But this cessation has a purpose. It does not end in itself. From the very foundation of the Jewish commonwealth the Sabbath was set apart from the world in order that it might be dedicated to God. To this end served the doubling on the Sabbath of the morning and evening sacrifices in the tabernacle and temple ; the habit, long before the building of synagogues up and down the country, of

resorting to the nearest prophet when the temple was far away for instruction in the Law, (2 Kings, iv. 23); the composition of certain Psalms—the 81st and the 92nd, for instance—for use, public and private, on the Sabbath; and upon the well-understood principle that the day was to be sanctified to religion and its duties are based the constant exhortations and remonstrances of Isaiah (lvi. lviii.); Jeremiah (xvii), and Ezekiel (xx).

We have here, then, the first principles of Sunday observance before us, supposing, as I do throughout, that they are to be elicited from Scripture; that the essence of the Fourth Commandment is moral in its nature, and consequently of perpetual obligation. And these first principles will be,—negatively, that we abstain from worldly and gainful business ourselves, and grant the like immunity to those who depend upon us, or are employed by us;—positively, that the time and energies so rescued from the service of the world should be devoted to God. These principles, as other like principles, are in the law of Moses fenced round with a number of concrete and detailed restrictions and ordinances. So to guard great duties by specific rules was needful for a nation so stubborn and unspiritual as the Jews; and was possible in a dispensation designed for a single nation tenanted a special district. As the other ceremonial elements of the Law, so those which cluster round the Sabbath, had for the Jew to be determined precisely. But now that the Jewish Church has expanded into the Christian, all such elements, from the nature of the case, not less than the positive prescription of the Gospel, pass away. They pass away not in the spirit, but in the letter; for our own day of rest can no more be rightly observed than the Sabbath of the Jews could without rules, but the rules of the Jews cannot be in all respects our rules. To exact of Christians in this climate that no fire should be lighted in their dwellings on the Sunday, would be to infringe in England the selfsame principle which in sunny Palestine would be honoured. In this, as in other such matters, no minute directions are to be found in the records from which alone we can draw what is universally and perpetually binding on the Church; and in this, as in other matters of ritual, worship, discipline, and so on, the ends to be aimed at are authoritatively laid down in the Word of God: means are to be adjusted—and in the diversity of countries, times, and men's manners variously adjusted—by the rulers of the Church, or, in their silence, by the individual conscience. It is to outward rules like these that St. Paul so often refers when he speaks of the Jewish Sabbath; 'Let no man judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect of an holyday, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days.' (Col. ii. 16). (cf. Rom. xiv. 15; Gal. iv. 10). He protests against bringing the whole Gentile Church under the bondage of the outward ordinances of Moses; not at all, as it seems to me, against the observance of Sunday or any other Christian festival. He condemns the Judaizing Christians who desired to bring back circumcision and the whole obsolete ritual and ceremonies of the Jews; not, surely, obedience to the Fourth Commandment. The many texts which prove that the Christians met solemnly and specially in their assembling themselves together on the first day (cf. Heb. x. 25; Acts xx. 7; 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2); the testimony of the famous letter of

Pliny to Trajan that the Christians were wont to meet on a 'stated day;' that of Justin Martyr that the day was 'the day called Sunday;' yes, even the very name of the Lord's Day,' 'the day consecrated and set apart from all others to the Lord, bestowed on it quite casually by St. John (Rev. i. 10),—interpreted as these notices constantly are by the unanimous witness of the Church, her liturgies and her ordinances,—sufficiently prove to my mind that the great principles of Sunday observance, as already deduced from the Decalogue, have ever been recognised in the Church as indefeasible.

We pass on to the application of these principles to ourselves and our own times,

Sunday is to be a holy day; but, as we allow that all its hours cannot be devoted directly to religious exercises. These, like every other work, perhaps more than any other, to be done well, require intermissions. How much of the Sunday shall we expect an earnest Christian to dedicate to worship, public and private, to meditation, to reading of Scripture? Here, as elsewhere in this matter, we must appeal to the willing mind, not to a legal bond. But if worldly employments are set aside for sacred ones, the same proportion of the Sunday may fairly be claimed for the latter, as would be spent out of an ordinary weekday in the former. Again, the Christian Church has, as it seems to me, something to be noted in the way of positive enactment as regards the day—I mean the Sunday Communion. It is abundantly clear that in the first ages of Christianity every one in full communion with the Church was expected and required to communicate as part of his regular worship on the Lord's Day. Our own Church, though she may not in our altered circumstances demand this, assuredly desires and encourages it. Much stress may justly be laid on this point. It may serve us as a valuable touchstone by which we may for ourselves and others try and determine many questions of detail. It seems almost enough, to a Churchman at least, if he inquires, 'How shall I spend my Sunday?' to reply, 'Begin it by devoutly communicating; and then pass it as befits a communicant.'

And this leads me to observe that more might, in my judgment, be done, especially in densely populated districts, towards bringing such a rule to bear. I cannot regard it as conducive to a due observance of the day after this, or, indeed, any other rule, to open it in the Church at eleven o'clock, with a long array of services—Morning Prayer, Litany, Communion, all aggregated. Least of all can this answer where the population consists of working men and the Church accommodation is insufficient. At the eleven o'clock service the Church—shall I say the pews?—will probably be wanted for the ladies and gentlemen who will be ready by that hour. Nor am I prepared to shut up the working man during the Sunday in his narrow dwelling within a foetid court. I would say, then, retain your midday service by all means for those whom it suits, but try an early service, a celebration if possible also; leave the midday hours for the artisan to spend with his family, which he too often perforce much neglects; let him have, if he please, and can, his Sunday walk in fresh air and green fields, and then at seven o'clock, or in the summer even later, invite him to an inviting Evensong.

But then there is the mass of Nonconformists, who recognise the authority of the Church when they keep Sunday instead of Saturday, but repudiate the same authority as to other and for most part lesser matters. It is no part of my business to defend their consistency; and I would rather see in this, and other ground which still remains common to us and them, a basis for future re-union than for present polemics. We cannot, however, handle the Sunday question without reference to them; nor yet without thought, too, of those who neglect religious ordinances almost if not altogether, but have a great interest notwithstanding in the preservation of the day intact and sacred.

Now, the one authority to which all bow is the law. Shall we ask for further legislative interference to protect our Sunday for us? Shall we seek to have a better observance of the Lord's Day enforced by the police? It is no doubt within the scope of the law to deal, if it be thought fit, with a subject so concerning to the public welfare, even to the public health. It may be even necessary so far to control private liberty as to take care that a few individuals in days of unrestricted competition do not, through greed of gain, compel others to sacrifice their day of rest. Yet I, for one, am disposed to be content with the law as it is. I am not sure that public opinion would back any new legislation on this matter—say, for instance, the absolute closing of public-houses on Sunday—and unless public opinion did so, the law in these days would not work. Neither let us forget that to constrain men to the forms of religion to which they have no mind is apt to produce hypocrisy rather than reform; and to generate a secret license which is worse than open profligacy. I prefer, then, as at present advised, to trust to moral rather than to legal agencies. And assuredly whilst so much of the desecration of Sunday in our large towns, London especially, is caused by the deliberate or careless selfishness of the wealthy, of the classes particularly amenable to expressions of public opinion—expressions such as it is the proper province of this Congress to give, opinions such as it is the function of this Congress to create—assuredly, I say, there is much to be done without going to Parliament. In some quarters of London more than half the shops are open on the Lord's Day—in the east for the supply of necessaries to the poor, in the west for purveying luxuries to the rich. Now, the fault as to both classes lies to a large extent neither at the door of the shopkeeper nor at that of the poor customer. The payment of wages late on Saturday by employers absolutely necessitates very much of the Sunday trading amongst the poor. The executing of Sunday orders for Sunday banquets causes poulterers, fishmongers, and others, with their families, apprentices and shopmen, to the number of many thousands, to keep hard at work on Sunday morning. A very little forethought,—such as I am informed is exercised in the highest household of the realm,—would obviate the necessity of all this. Let what is wanted be delivered on Saturday. I am no advocate for Sunday fasting; but I think that the man who insists that his neighbour shall surrender his day of rest that the fish for his own Sunday dinner may be of the freshest, hardly does as he would be done by. And newspapers, periodicals, cigars, and tobacco, is it too much to ask that a sufficient supply be laid in on Saturday to enable nature to hold out till Monday morning? And from tobacco

we pass, as it were naturally, to the railways. Did the Companies note the appearance of the Sunday question in our programme, and withdraw in spite the facilities for this Congress, which they afford so freely to races, concerts, and fairs? Owing them nothing, we can at any rate speak our mind about them without ceremony, and say what is the fact, that they, or rather some of them, are amongst the greatest and most wanton promoters of Sunday desecration in the country. I do not say that when they have monopolised all the locomotive machinery available to the public they ought, in any district, to be absolutely shut up on Sunday, but that does not bar our censure of of them for their system of Sunday excursions. The Brighton,—the South Eastern,—the Great Western,—the Great Eastern,—the Chatham and Dover,—not a very prosperous group,—tempt men from their churches and their homes, and create a large Sunday traffic which is as needless as it is pernicious. It is altogether a mistake to think that the working men, speaking of them generally, in London or the large towns, desire these Sunday excursions. "Saint Monday" is pretty generally kept by such men, and offers an opportunity for short excursions which themselves and their families prefer when they can. We have it, too, on record¹ from the manager for eighteen years of the largest railway concern, and one of the best conducted, too, in the world, that in his judgment "no railway ultimately benefits by working its system seven days a week." that "by a well-arranged system of Saturday trains returning on Monday an equal pecuniary return, at much less cost, is produced:" that during his management "no excursion trains ever ran on Sunday," and that he is "satisfied that, while the interests of the proprietors did not suffer the discipline and character of the company were promoted:" and so on. [Here Mr. Espin having exhausted the time allowed to him retired; the remainder of his paper is as follows.] Two other sides of this part of the question must be glanced at: (1) the ill-fated excursion districts, inundated often at midday on Sunday by crowds of those who do not go to church or chapel, and are by the railway policy weeded out of their own haunts and cast loose to demoralise many an orderly country parish; (2) the railway officials themselves, always worked up to the full extent of their powers on the six days, and forced besides to toil and worry after a peculiarly agitating and trying kind of traffic all Sunday. Is it wonderful that scarce an accident occurs but we are called on to note that station-master, pointsman, driver, or guard, was knocked up and unfit for work?

Questions of detail arise in great numbers, which time will not permit me to deal with one by one. Some of them, as the Sunday postal delivery, must, I think, find their solution in a larger and more liberally paid staff of servants, which the Post-office can at all events well afford, rather than in additional restrictions to be borne by the public. As to others, we can only insist that certain great principles shall not be lost sight of, and leave their application to the good sense and benevolence of employers, masters of households, and the public. On the one hand, to fling broadcast the sentence of Sabbath-breaking

(1) See a letter of Mr. M. Huish, late of the L. and N. W. R., to Rev. H. V. Elliot, published in a pamphlet entitled "The Sunday Question," Macintosh, London.

on those who eat hot meat, or read newspapers and poetry, or shave themselves, on Sunday, is unwarrantable in itself, and is more likely to bring religion into ridicule than repute. But a man may fairly be asked whether he ought habitually to rob another of his birthright, his weekly day of rest, that his own may pass more agreeably to himself.

We shall all, perhaps, agree, as our Master took His walk through the cornfields on the Sabbath, that the quiet stroll after church is lawful on Sunday,—to many in our large towns perhaps necessary; and we could not, therefore, call for the closing of parks and public gardens on Sunday. We should nearly all agree that lectures, exhibitions, and entertainments opened for money are obviously inadmissible. Of these there are many kinds, and if one is tolerated none can be excluded, except such as are prohibited on week-days too. Yet when once the sacredness of the day is surrendered, the battle is lost indeed. Give place to merely secular instruction and amusement, and labour is not far behind. The Sunday which is not expressly set aside for God will soon be bought up by Mammon. Whatever we approve as citizens, whatever we permit as householders, whatever we allow ourselves in as individuals, the overruling, pervading spirit should be this—the day is not a *holiday* merely, but also and more especially a *holy day*.

I conclude with one or two maxims which we shall all do well to apply to this subject:—

A good example is better than many precepts.

Abstain from what is doubtful; ‘whatsoever is not of faith is sin.’

Be strict with yourself, considerate with others.”

DISCUSSION.

The Right Hon. JOSEPH NAPIER: It appears to me that many of the difficulties connected with this subject have arisen from the fact that some are too ready to accept the Pharisaic perversion of the Fourth Commandment, and to treat it as if it was the true interpretation. I think they do not sufficiently attend to the key which our blessed Lord has Himself left us to its meaning and interpretation. He has most specially shown it to us in a benign light—as a commandment intended for the good of man, and not a mere penal law, or one of formal severity. We have been accused of treating it as a mere positive law—a law of such strictness that it could not be obeyed; but those who say that it is so are anxious to take it down from its Divine foundation, in order that they may take greater liberties with it. But our blessed Lord has offered us a more beautiful and benign interpretation of it than this. He has told us that God will have mercy and not sacrifice; and he added that wonderfully pregnant observation—“My Father worketh hitherto and I work.” The law of the week presents to us six days of labour and one of rest, because in six days God created all things and rested on the seventh. But the Sabbath is not to be a mere day of bodily ease and indulgence; for He says, “My Father worketh hitherto and I work.” Though God rests from creation He continues His providential and fatherly care over His creatures. Our Lord, too, though He has completed His work of atonement, still continues to watch over us as our Guide, our Redeemer, and our Sanctifier. He teaches us that those who pay an exaggerated deference to the letter of the commandment, do by that very circumstance violate its first principle. He has sanctioned hospitality on the Sabbath day; and when He went to the feast at the house of the chief Pharisee, He rebuked those who took the chief seats. He rebuked also the Pharisee himself for not sharing his hospitality with his poorer neighbours; but we do not find that He spake of the feast itself as if it had been

against the law. Does this, however, give any encouragement to those who would wish to take the Sabbath down from its Divine foundation, and make it a kind of festival with which they may do what they like? See how it is dealt with in that magnificent sketch of the Christian Church in Isaiah. There it is presented to us not as a day of severity, but as "My Holy Day;" as a day "holy to the Lord and honourable." The prophet speaks of it as a day in which the "sons of the stranger," that is to say, the whole Christian Church, has an interest. He denounces threats on those who pollute the Sabbath, and attaches a bright promise to those who reverence it. I do not go much into the argument as to whether the Sabbath was observed before the giving of the law, because the point is a very doubtful and obscure one. I think there is on the whole a slight balance in favour of the belief that there was some observance of the day before the time of Moses; but in the Decalogue we have this law stamped with universality as a law of beneficence, and as one intended for the advantage even of the stranger and the cattle. If that be embodied in the Decalogue—that Divine and comprehensive code of law which no human legislation can ever rival—if we have our Lord clearing it of Pharisaic excess, and declaring that the Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath—what reason have we for saying that it was only Jewish, local, national? It is God's day—"My Holy Day"—the day on which He rested from His work, and which He has sanctified; and that is a reason for its observance as wide as humanity and as deep as the Divine counsels. But again, how does the Church of England treat the Sabbath?—because here at a Church Congress we may very properly ask, which view has our Church taken of it, and is that view of it agreeable to the Word of God? Now, in answering that question, we naturally look to her articles and formularies. The 35th article incorporates certain homilies; and though I agree that we are not to insist too stringently on every expression which may occur in these homilies, I assume that we may take them as substantially containing the doctrine and law of the national Church. What then do the homilies say respecting the Sabbath? "If we will be the children of our heavenly Father, we must be careful to keep the Christian Sabbath day, which is the Sunday, not only for that it is God's express commandment, but also to declare ourselves to be loving children, in following the example of our gracious Lord and Father." And again—"Sithence which time God's people hath always, in all ages, without any gainsaying, used to come together upon the Sunday, to celebrate and honour the Lord's blessed name, and carefully to keep that day in holy rest and quietness, both man, woman, child, servant, and stranger." (1) I do not deny that there are some difficulties with regard to the change of the day; because we find that in the apostle's time, the Jewish Sabbath continued in force. St. Paul himself went into a synagogue on the Sabbath, and took advantage of that circumstance to preach the gospel. The change came gradually about; but I think it is clear that taking the commandment as ordaining six days of labour and one for rest, in imitation of God Himself, and remembering that the particular day must vary according to the meridian, the day itself is not of the essence of the command. What is essential is that there should be one rest day in seven. When therefore you find that the Catholic Church has gradually and calmly adopted the day of our Lord's rising from the dead, and the day of the descent of the Holy Spirit, and has made that a day of rest and worship—when you find that that was done with one consent—and when you find that our Church takes the same view of it in her baptismal service, where the Ten Commandments, the Creed, and the Lord's Prayer are directed to be taught the child—I mean of course the Ten Commandments as interpreted by the light of the gospel—when you find, moreover, that the Ten Commandments are placed in the very forefront of the most beautiful of our services, the Holy Communion, where the people are directed to beg God's pardon for any breach of the fourth commandment for the time past and grace to keep the same for the time to come, just as in the case of all the rest—when you find all this, I ask, how is it possible for any churchman to get up and say that this law is not binding upon us? Or how is it possible to suppose that Christ, by whom and for whom all things were created, would not extend to all the world that beneficent command to keep God's rest day which had been given to the Jews; and how then can it possibly be regarded as a mere ritual ordinance, and as merely a part of the Mosaic law? No. I cannot but think that our Church, following the Church Catholic, takes up the true position. As regards the working classes—I hate the term, for every man is bound to a life of labour—every man, whatever his condition, is bound to work and labour honestly; but every man has a divine right to his periodical day of rest. We cannot lay down in precise terms what he should do with it—that must be left to every man to decide for himself; but do not let us encourage those whose object seems to be to find out how little they can give to

God, instead of how much. We should strive to make the Sabbath a day of joy, of gladness, and of attendance upon the worship of God. I do not mean to deny that men may on that day admire the works and productions of nature; but a great philosopher has said, "I have sought Thee in the fields and gardens; but I have found Thee in Thy temples."

The Rev. H. STEVENS: Not long since, in London, I had an opportunity of asking an intelligent mechanic, a member of a trades' union, who was working with a large body of men, how he accounted for the jealousy manifested by working men at any attempt to encroach upon the rest of the Lord's Day. He replied: I don't think religion has got much to do with it; but I will tell you some of the reasons why I myself and many of my fellow workmen feel strongly upon the matter. We find that by the time a man has lived fifty years he has had in Sundays seven years' rest, and has paid nothing for it; because we find that we have had at the end of the year just as much wages as men working at a similar calling in countries where the Lord's Day is not observed. Then we look at it in another point of view. We cannot see any other country in the world in which Sunday is regarded as other days, in which men are not called upon more or less to work as on other days. We see that various other countries of Europe may have more amusements on Sunday, but we see also that they have much more physical labour on Sunday than we have. We see no country in Europe where so large a portion of the people have such a proportion of rest as one day in seven, and therefore we think we cannot do better "than rest and be thankful," and let well alone." In contending for the rest of the Lord's Day, it is most important that we should not even seem to encroach upon the liberty of our fellow men. Love to God and love to man should alike move us to gain, if possible, for every man one day's rest in seven. But having succeeded, we are not to interfere with each man's right to spend the Sabbath as he likes. True, we may set before him what we believe to be the duties and privileges of the Lord's Day. And we may appeal to his conscience and understanding against his efforts to rob his fellow men of the like rest to that which he enjoys. And there may even be times when the Legislature may be justified in preventing associations of men, for Gain or for Pleasure, coming between God and man to intercept our Sabbaths. But we may go no further. Like every other talent, health, property, and the like, the Sabbath is entrusted to every man to use or to abuse. To his own master he stands or falls. And we may no more collar a man to drag him to public worship, than compel him mechanically to read the Word of God. With regard to what is called "Sabbath Legislation," I would observe, that the mind of Parliament and of the nation has been of late so distracted by measures which have either attempted too much or too little, that if renewed attempts are now made, such legislation will take a direction right opposite to that which the promoters of it expect or desire. And yet it is possible by moral means even now to do much to liberate from Sunday toil multitudes of our countrymen who are still groaning under it. For example: In the year 1851, when it was proposed to give the cabmen in London the option of taking out his license for six days or seven, the attempt was scouted. It was thought absurd to suppose that the London cabmen would sacrifice a day's earnings for a day's rest; but from that time to this there has been a steady progress until now. Out of six thousand cabmen more than one third are for six days; and of the 507 applications which were made last year, only 188 were for seven days licenses. Now as supply and demand will equalise themselves, these facts show the desire of the public to give the cabman the rest he needs. Take another instance. About a year ago the managers of the respective railways having termini in London, were one by one applied to with respect to the liberation of many hundreds of persons, whom the Sunday arrangements on the subject of the delivery of parcels kept at their daily labour. Anxious as they were to liberate these people, the companies could not believe that the public would sustain them in the attempt. It was then suggested that a trial should be made, and that the public should be informed that no parcel would be delivered on Sunday, unless it was required to be sent to its destination by special messenger. That has been done, and in no single instance, has any public remonstrance been made against this arrangement, which has set railway servants free. It is now in contemplation to extend it throughout the whole kingdom, by which it would set at liberty about 10,000 men. Now this instance shows that, even if the legislature, in the present state of the public mind, may not be called to prevent a particular class from being borne down by mammon, yet if the public are desirous of their own free will to liberate that class from Sunday labour they may do it. If we turn from the observance of the Lord's Day to look at the foundation on which it rests, I think we may see at least two points

of universal agreement. For general experience and physiological science testify that man is so constituted by nature, that, as a late most eminent physician informed a committee of the House of Commons, the rest of night does not fully compensate for the wear and tear of day; so that an additional rest of one day in seven is absolutely necessary to restore the balance. Sir David Wilkie in one of his letters says, "I have known many artists who worked on Sunday, and every one of them was soon incapacitated from working at all." Lord Macaulay, too, once observed that the Sunday rest was not waste; for on that day processes were going on that were quite as indispensable as food or sleep. Man—that machine of machines—a machine compared with which the inventions of Watt and Arkwright were clumsy contrivances—the human machine was on Sunday being repaired, wound up, and rendered capable of returning to his labour with renewed spirit and corporeal vigour. Lord Macaulay remarked, "of course I don't mean to say that a man cannot accomplish more in seven days than he can in six; but in twenty years a man will certainly accomplish less if he works seven days a week than if he had worked six." But we must also all agree that this necessity for the rest of one day in seven is found also in our moral and spiritual nature. Montalembert put this point clearly before the French House of Assembly in 1848, when he said: "There can be no religion without public worship; there can be no public worship without a Sunday." That is to say, common prayer, common praise, the common teaching of the Word of God, and the common participation in the Sacraments of our Lord's death, are not possible, and temples, services, ministers, however numerous and excellent, are not available, unless there are times of rest common to us all. By the Institution of the Sabbath, then, Jehovah walked through the world before us, and, by anticipation, built for mankind time—temples. Here then we have this Institution of the Sabbath in ourselves. It is a point of ourselves. Like food, or sleep, this rest of one day in seven is a necessity of our nature, and we cannot live in health, physical or spiritual, without it. There is, however, yet a third point on which there can be no difference of opinion, namely, that God has a right, a moral right, to claim from created intelligences, not merely private, but also public, or common worship. In that world and life to come, to which with divinely inspired devotion we look up, the proportion of time demanded for collective or common worship is far greater than that which is demanded or can be given here on earth. But even in this state and life, there must be a proportion, a just and equitable proportion of our time due to God for common worship. And what this proportion should be, it is not surely for man to determine, but God. Has he fixed the proportion? I believe he has. One day in seven could be thus set apart to Him. In our very nature we find the evidence that thus we should not perform less work, while we might have even more physical enjoyment of the present life. Thus, then, while God has not fixed the time we are to devote to our private and personal devotions, but tests our love by leaving us each one to decide for himself, the very existence of religion demanded that He should set apart a just proportion of time for common worship. And God's right, moral right, a right that has its root in the eternal and unchangeable nature of things, is the root of the fourth commandment. Its head and crown is, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." Its foundation is: That it is "The Sabbath of the Lord thy God;" and the consideration of all that God is, and has done for us in His wonderful and glorious creation in which we dwell.

Archdeacon DENISON: I desire to address a very few words to this Congress upon three points in this discussion. The first is with regard to something that has been said with respect to the change from the seventh day of the week to the first. I beg to submit, with great respect, to men who are much more competent to decide this question, that there is a very simple solution of it; and that is, that as God the Creator finished and completed the work which He had created and made—His material work—in six days, so our blessed Lord who came to make a new creation, the spiritual creation, when he rose in the morning of the first day, finished, and created the work which He came to do. And therefore the Church had the great privilege of doing that which she was undoubtedly free and commissioned by the authority of the Holy Spirit to do, when she settled and fixed that the first day should come in the place of the seventh. In the next place it has given me great satisfaction that nothing should have fallen from any speaker to countenance the notion that the poorer classes are those who do not observe the Lord's day, and that the rich are those who do. Now I believe that in this, as in other matters, it is the richer classes who are to blame for examples of departure from God's law; and I believe that from the highest quarters it would be well if a better example were set.

I am thankful to say that not one word has fallen from the readers of the two admirable papers we have just heard, in which any one could trace an atom of unkindness to the poorer classes. On the contrary, their right has been recognised to their day of rest; and if there are many among them who are disposed to abuse that which is their common right, or to apply to other purposes the day of rest which God has given them, I believe it is mainly to be traced to that greed of wealth in this country which prevents the people from having any holidays, and so the greatest fast of the Christian Church is turned into a day of positive revel. We shall never get right until the poorer classes are allowed time for those pursuits to which they apply the holidays and the fasts of the Church. Now I will, in conclusion, relate a short story which I heard yesterday respecting a parish in the south of England, the name of which will come home to every man's heart, for the name of this parish is Hursley. There were certain young gentlemen at Winchester who went about preaching. Now in these days of spiritual destitution one can hardly find fault with any one that tries to reclaim the wanderers, though I certainly regret that persons should go to preach in parishes where there are regular clergy of the Church of England. These gentlemen, however, went on Sunday afternoon to Hursley—when they got there they said, "Dear me, where are all the people?" "Oh," said one poor child whom they at last found, and who had been left at home with a sick brother, "they are all at church." "Then we will stay till they come out," said the young gentlemen, and stay they did. But when church was over they observed the congregation streaming towards a particular field, and they asked, "Where are they all going?" "They are all going to play at cricket," was the answer. I, too, should have gone to play at cricket.

MR. BERESFORD HOPE, M.P.: I am sure we could have had no better evidence that the spirit in which these Congresses are conducted is rather that of finding points of agreement than points of difference, than the way in which this matter has been treated. Our subject is the very practical one of the due observance of the Lord's day—a subject as regards which there are in the Church of England two schools, I will not say of discrepant opinions, but of discrepant trains of thought, that influence the opinions of persons. One train of thought goes back to the old oracles of God and to His ancient people; and this leads some to cherish the old word "Sabbath;" but there are also many holy and pious men, who from no scepticism as to the Old Testament or the Mosaic law, but from a deep and abiding love of our risen Lord, and a sense of the superiority of the Christian dispensation, never use the word "Sabbath," but who always speak of it as "the Lord's Day." Now these two classes can and do meet here to-day, and they feel bound to acknowledge each other's earnestness for Christ's religion. Reference has been made to the Catechism and to the Decalogue; but how does the Catechism interpret the Decalogue, in regard to the fourth commandment? Is it not that "I may serve Him truly *all* the days of my life?" and not merely on the seventh day. Let me as a layman say a few words on this topic: because, while there are certain questions which are no doubt specially clerical, there are others that are in an equal degree lay questions, in which I reckon all those which concern the ordinances of the Church, for that which is the duty of the clergy is the privilege of the laity. Let me, therefore, as a layman, call upon this Congress to try to screw up the public opinion of the Church in the matter of Sunday observance, and especially on a point which was slightly referred to by the reader of the second paper, and also alluded to in a few words by the second speaker. Whatever we may think of the Sunday Trains, or of other minor details, there is one Sunday shortcoming, on which all church people must be agreed, and of which the remedy is in our own hands. England will not duly observe the Lord's Day as she ought, until she does in her churches that which she has not hitherto done, namely, "Show forth the Lord's death till He come,"—upon every Lord's Day,—in all her churches. I say in this great assembly of churchmen of all opinions, of all views, and of all ideas of ceremonial, that if people will hear their open Bible, if people will hear their Church, if people will hear their Prayer-book, they will not cease until they agree with one accord to make weekly Communion the rule instead of the exception. With weekly Communion how many questions that now trouble and gravel us would solve themselves! They would solve themselves *ambulando*; the moment they were approached they would vanish away. Look at our prayer book and at the rubrics at the end of the services. What do they—some of the saddest utterances into which any church in its distress ever broke out—mean if not—"Would that we could have weekly Communion everywhere; but where we can have it, there it shall be." It was, I believe, the civil war in the middle of the seventeenth century, in which both parties were so much to blame, and in which the

Jewish Sabbath was unfortunately made, on one side, a battle cry, which prevented the practice which these rubrics upheld from being carried out; while, on the other hand, it was from that court with its sin that the puritanical view of the Lord's Day which is still so prevalent. At the present time we are being brought face to face with the ancient episcopal churches in the East and in the West; and it is well known that whatever faults and whatever corruptions may be charged upon the Church of Rome, or upon the Churches of the East, with one thing they are not chargeable, and that is the infrequent celebration of the Holy Eucharist. What use is it for us to go on talking about more friendly relations with the rest of Christendom, until we have cast this beam out of our own eye? Or how can we approach our nonconforming brethren, or the Protestant bodies upon the Continent, if we do not show what is the practical working of our episcopal Church—if we do not show that the episcopate and the priesthood are God's gift, and have been vouchsafed to the Christian Church, but answering to an end, and that end the due celebration of the blessed Sacraments. ("Question.") I did not mean to add one more word; but I will say this, that the gentleman who called "question," does not understand what the question is.

The Rev. J. BANDINEL: I had intended to say a great deal upon this subject, which is one upon which I have bestowed much thought and study; but what has been advanced by previous speakers, with whom I entirely agree, has left me little to add. There is, however, one point that has not been entirely exhausted; and that is the fourth Commandment as it is delivered in Exodus. In that, it is not said that the Lord blessed the seventh day, but that He blessed the Sabbath day. (1) It is the seventh day, not in rotation, but in proportion; and the precept would apply equally as well to the second as to the seventh. It would be impossible in a world-wide commandment to take any particular twenty-four hours, because that twenty-four hours would not correspond with the same time of the day in every part of the earth; and the Sabbath would therefore commence in some places at one o'clock, in others at two, in others at four, and so on. A law which was intended to be imposed upon the whole human race must have been one adapted to all ages, and all times and seasons throughout the earth. I myself believe, as has been well said, that the Sabbath owed its origin to the command of God at the close of the creation; and that we may derive an argument from what our Lord has said, which may answer the argument from what He has not said, with regard to its perpetual obligation. Our Lord declares Himself to be the Lord of the Sabbath; and interpreting these words according to the principle which He has Himself laid down, namely, that "God is not the God of the dead but of the living," how can we believe that our Lord would announce Himself to be Lord of that which was passing away? The Sabbath was made for man from his first breath in Eden to his last gasp on the Day of Judgment; and our Lord, who as the representative Man is Lord of the Sabbath, will continue to be such till he enters into that final *Sabbatismus* which remaineth to the people of God.

The ARCHBISHOP of YORK then pronounced the benediction.

1 Exodus xx., 11.

SOCIAL CONDITION AND RECREATIONS OF THE POORER CLASSES.

The Congress re-assembled in the New Hall at 7 P.M., the Lord BISHOP of RIPON in the Chair.

THE REV. E. J. RANDOLPH READ THE FOLLOWING PAPER:—

The existing condition of the poorer classes, in matters social and religious, can hardly be contemplated by serious persons without some degree of pain, or without a feeling that exertions for improvement are urgently required—and in no case more so, than in the character of their recreations.

There are persons who question the expediency, if not, the lawfulness of amusements, and who seem to think that religion and recreation

can hardly co-exist. To me it rather appears that it is the divorce of religion from recreation that we have to lament, and that the direction which our efforts should take is that of re-uniting these two requirements of human nature. That in former days they were more combined than they are now, admits, I suppose, of no doubt. The days which our Church marks as red letter days, were intended to be days of refreshment; and if the spirit of the Church's appointment had been carried out those days, or some of them, would have been observed as days of joy, in which each part of man's compound nature would have its appropriate share. The spirit would be upraised to God by exercises of a directly religious nature, and the body would be refreshed by amusements of a cheerful but not irreligious kind.

In an act passed in the reign of Edward VI. there occurs a special provision that labourers may work on *holidays in Harvest*. The exemption shewing that at other periods of the year it was expected that such festival times would be occasions, to use the words of Hooker, of vacation from labour; and in the publication afterwards of proclamations with regard to sports we see evidence of the care that it was deemed right to take for the healthful amusements of the people.

The reducing of the Lord's Day to the mere level of an ecclesiastical Festival was assuredly a great mistake—and one which paved the way for that subsequent reaction which has produced in our time an almost entire neglect of the minor Festivals. The Lord's Day has a character of its own. It is consecrated by God himself, and therefore ought to be preserved from the secularizing influences of either work or sport; but the mingling of recreation with acts of a religious character on other days, as is now done on our Harvest Festivals, was no doubt a wise arrangement; and had the theory of our Church in this respect been more acted upon, we might have escaped much of the viciousness of existing times of amusement, and have been preserved from much of the desecration of the Lord's Day which we now deplore. Probably, also, we should have heard less frequently the excuse commonly pleaded for neglect of the special duties of the Lord's Day,—that the difficulty of securing intervals of rest at other times induces the conversion of that day into a season of mere bodily refreshment. In this case, also, we might have been spared the pain of witnessing the prevalent melancholy perversion of so solemn a day as Good Friday, or the unhappy neglect of special Fast Days, when ordered by authority in times of national distress; turned as they are into days of mere pleasure hunting, if not of actual revelry. Under existing circumstances, the moment work ceases, no matter what the ground of its interruption, the working classes are apt to dedicate the time so gained to purposes of enjoyment, and of enjoyment after their own fashion. In days, then, when much is attempted for the education and elevation of the labouring classes, an improvement of their tastes with respect to the mode of amusing themselves, and also with regard to the choice of times for doing so, is an object worthy of serious attention. However much we may attempt in our Schools recreative culture, or labour, as we do, to instil into the minds of our *very youthful* pupils a horror of that which is coarse, profane, and sinful, I believe that our exertions will lose much of their effect

40 *Social Condition and Recreations of the Poorer Classes.*

unless we can succeed in diminishing the amount of temptation to which our scholars are afterwards exposed in *their* fashionable places of amusement.

To secure for them the possibility of recreation free from the attractions of vice seems to me one of the greatest wants of the day, and that without which no substantial improvement of the masses can be expected.

But now, what is the ordinary method of amusement amongst the poor?

Omitting all consideration of races, and of excursion trains, on which, if time had permitted I should have been glad to say a few words, I think that, in the agricultural districts at least, Fairs, and village Feasts, or Wakes, are the chief places of resort on the part of the working classes in their days of recreation. Hume tells us of a time when kings and bishops gave encouragement and protection to wakes, and other such cheerful festivals of the common people. Could they do so in their present condition? Fairs were originally places of business. They have now become, with the exception of certain great marts for the sale of horses and cattle, and of statute fairs for the hiring of agricultural servants, occasions of meeting for pleasure rather than for business. But are the pleasures, which prove so attractive, innocent? Are fairs, as now conducted, opportunities of healthful recreation? Can we shut our eyes to the fact that they are seasons of imminent peril to the moral and spiritual interests of the young of both sexes?

And, here, I would advert more particularly to the statute fairs for the hiring of farm servants; a remnant, as I believe, of an antiquated system of protection and class legislation totally unsuited to the less restrictive policy of present times. Somewhat more than a century ago, statute *sessions* were held by the high constable in every hundred for the placing of servants. Young persons who were out of employment had places then found for them, to which they were obliged to go. The compulsory assignment of places has long ceased. The statute *fair* has taken the place of the statute *sessions*; negotiations in the statute fair are *voluntarily* conducted: the old remnant of protection, however, remains in the compulsory bond of service for a year. Of late, I believe, that the number of engagements made in the statute fair has sensibly diminished. Farmers themselves are beginning to feel the inconvenience of engaging servants in the absence of all preliminary enquiry into character, and before the fair-day arrives many have completed their compacts for the ensuing year. The business transactions of the statute fair are thus lessened; but as a scene of gaiety and pleasure it is the resort of all the young servants within reach, who claim the privilege of a week's holiday at the end of the year for which they were bound, and, whether they have, or have not, obtained situations for the succeeding year, rush to the fair for the sake of its amusements; and I am sure that no one can stroll through the streets of a town on statute fair day, and observe the promiscuous assemblage of young persons, not only in the street, but also in the public houses, open to them as they are, in many instances, from the lowest to the highest story; no one can think of the treating to drink,

of the public house dance with which the festivities of the day generally conclude, and of the late return home, and not perceive that these young persons are exposed to great and obvious dangers.

It often happens that they attend more than one of such fairs during their holiday week ; but, if this be not the case, attractions are offered at the public houses of their native villages during the period of their stay at home, and the public house dance is one of the most popular entertainments of the time. I know a village in the East Riding where the greatest pains have been taken to interest and amuse the servants during the Martinmas week by magic lanterns, music, readings, and such like. The counter attraction, however, of the public house dance has proved too strong ; some have come in for a short time to the one, and have then gone for the remainder of the evening to the other, and in very few cases was the one allowed to be a substitute for the other. A Clergyman writing from that quarter says,—I have seldom seen a sadder aspect than that presented by the farm servants, both male and female, last Martinmas week. When they have a week to themselves, it seems as if “ they fear not God, neither regard man.” Of the terrible demoralization occasioned by the existing system there can be no doubt.

Oh ! that our chief proprietors could be persuaded to bestir themselves, and to use their influence with their tenantry, in promoting the introduction of an item of social reform than which there is none more loudly called for, more imperatively required. Well would it be if Local Committees were organized in every district where a system so fatal to the morals of the young is maintained, for securing its extinction, and providing a substitute. My own belief is that the evils of the existing system with regard to the hiring, and the holidays of farm servants, can only be removed by the discontinuance of *simultaneous hirings*, and of *simultaneous holidays*.

That all farm servants, and other work people, should have their recreation days I most earnestly desire ; but I do think that it is a great misfortune to any neighbourhood that all the farm servants of the district should be keeping holiday at the same moment, and flocking together in large numbers to a central rendezvous.

I believe that the time is come when the system of binding servants in the agricultural districts to employers for a year might with advantage be dispensed with. Farmers could easily be supplied with hands for their work by the ordinary channels of supply. The introduction of machinery, increased facilities of communication, alterations also in the law of settlement, place them on a level with other classes of employers. Agriculture needs no special protection. No doubt the notion of leaving the farmer to his own resources in the matter of labour will at first create as great an alarm as did the prospect of the abolition of the protective duty upon corn ; but I believe that this change would confer a benefit upon the community, farmers and their servants included, as great, as did the other ;—yes, and even greater, inasmuch as the moral health of a people infinitely transcends in importance the by no means unimportant matter of its commercial prosperity.

If, however, protection must, in this instance, be upheld—if the yearly bond of service must be retained—let us, at least, so far

modify the system, as that the year's engagement shall not terminate at precisely the same period in all the farm houses of a district.

If hiring at statute fairs were discontinued, as has been done in some parts of England with no bad effects, and if other media of communication, such as register offices in every market town, were established, the period of servitude might, as in the case of domestic servants, begin and end at any time, and the need of attending the statute fair in search of servants would be altogether obviated.

And, as regards servants' holidays,—there is in almost every village a feast time when friends meet. At that time servants might be permitted to visit their homes, and attend the family gathering; and as all the servants on a farm would not come from the same parish, the farmer would not be subject to the inconvenience of having all his household absent at the same moment.

In order, however, to make such a plan effective, the village feast must itself be put upon a better footing.

The fair was originally a place of general business; the village feast simply a local holiday. The time at which it was held is not unfrequently that of the Church dedication, and it was no doubt in the first instance a parochial celebration of a religious privilege. In process of time the religious element was dropped, and the feast turned into a mere gathering for pleasure. An influx of strangers altered the complexion of the time,—drunkenness and revelling ensued.

In days when Sunday sports were legalized the proviso that persons might not assemble *out of their own* parishes was intended as a security for quietness and good order. If we could now have similar security in the case of the village feast, its general tone might be greatly improved.

Let its original character of a purely local holiday be restored. Let it be a holiday not for the working classes only, but one in which all residents within the parish should manifest an interest. Let not the wealthier inhabitants keep aloof under the idea that they have their own society and amusements, and that they will leave the vulgar sort to themselves in theirs. No, here more than anywhere does the gap between the classes require arching over. It is the withdrawal of the upper classes from the festivities of the poor, that has led to the coarseness and intemperance which now defile their seasons of amusement, and are so sad a blot upon our national Christianity.

Sympathy is the remedy most needed for the cure of the present evils in our social system, and sympathy principally manifested by personal sacrifices, and exertions for the poor.

Who can doubt the sympathy of those good ladies who nursed our soldiers wounded in the Crimea; or that of those who are even now tending the sick in our cholera hospitals;—who can doubt the gratitude of those who are the objects of such beneficence?

Let the poor feel that persons of influence sympathise with them in their joys, as well as in their sorrows; in *their hours of recreation*, as well as in the season of affliction; and desire to afford them opportunities of rational enjoyment, and such sympathy will assuredly not be fruitless.

Time was, we are told, when the gentlefolk of the manor-house thought it not beneath them to come down into the crowded street,

and give countenance to the festivities. Arm-in-arm would the squire and his dame, and other members of the family, move dignifiedly through the fair, receiving universal homage, as a reward for the sympathy which they showed with the needs and enjoyments of their inferiors.

At the fair of Charlton, in Kent, not much beyond the recollection of living persons, the wife of Sir Thomas Wilson was accustomed to make her appearance with her proper attendants, walking forth from the family mansion into the crowded streets, where she was sure to be hailed with a band of music got up *gratefully* in her especial honour.

It is surely, says one in Chambers' Book of Days, not in *the giving up* of such kindly customs, that the *progress* of our age is to be marked. Does it not rather indicate *retrogression*? Very pleasing was the account in the public journals the other day of the Queen honouring with her presence an entertainment given to servants and dependents, and of the Royal princes manifesting their interest by themselves joining in the merry dance. The only drawback was the lateness of the hour to which the entertainment was prolonged. It is impossible not to regret the waste of time and strength, and the other attendant evils, which the late hours in fashionable circles entail. It is unfortunate that, in this particular, superiors do not set an example more worthy of imitation by inferiors; and in pleading for a better style of amusements for the poor, we would advocate moderation in hours, as in all other respects; and here I am tempted to ask whether, seeing that of all evening entertainments none is so popular as the dance amongst the young of all classes, it is impossible that efforts should be made to improve the mode in which this natural taste is gratified in the case of the humbler classes. We cannot prohibit, may we not reform. Is the publican to be the only one to cater for them in this respect?

I honestly think that this is a question which should not be treated with Puritanical moroseness. Other countries have their national dances, and is not our own country dance one in which our rustics used to join on the village green? is it impossible that at harvest festivals, or at the village feast, they should do the like again in the presence of parents and superiors?

Before, however, the recreative gatherings of the labouring classes can be materially improved, a preliminary reform is essentially necessary, namely, that of the public-house or licensing system.

The great bane of such times is intemperance, and the great incentive to intemperance, where public-houses are numerous, is the competition for custom on the part of publicans, who throw out baits of various kinds to draw company to their houses. A revision of the licensing system, a more effective superintendence of public-houses, and greater facility for the reduction of their number, where reduction seems advisable, are great desiderata.

The license is now regarded as a species of private property, not to be interfered with except in cases of repeatedly proved misconduct, legal and moral proof being two very different things. But, are the temporal interests of publicans, or of brewers, with whom also great responsibility rests, to be set against the moral and religious interests of the working man? Are souls to be imperilled that the integrity of

44 *Social Condition and Recreations of the Poorer Classes.*

a particular species of property may be maintained? Is the difference between a large, or a small rent, to stand in the way of social improvement? No! less jealousy for material interests, and more jealousy for spiritual interests, will injure no class, will benefit all classes. Let greater securities be exacted for the good order of public-houses, and for the character of those allowed to keep them: for this the formal testimonial is not sufficient. It would, perhaps, be well that the cost of the license should be diminished, and that the party to whom it is entrusted should in return be made more amenable to official control. Magistrates in petty sessions might be empowered to issue special regulations from time to time, as they seem to be required.

Again, when general holidays occur, the plan of opening out gentlemen's parks has been tried with considerable success.

In the Pottery districts of Staffordshire an annual holiday is observed called Wake Week—a period which has been notorious for grievous excess and dissipation. For the last few years the Duke of Sutherland has thrown open his park on a certain day in that week to the work-people of the neighbourhood. Trentham Thursday is now regarded in Stoke-upon-Trent, and its vicinity, as a favourite day. As many as 70,000 persons have been known to avail themselves of the privilege of a day's pleasure there. Some take their provisions with them, and enjoy a pic-nic in the park; others buy them in a refreshment booth in a field outside the park. Dispersed about they break up into knots, and either dance to the music of an organ, or play at rounders or other games. Such opportunities tend to diminish selfishness; young and old go out together; the house in the town is deserted; the door is locked; father, mother, and children sally forth together to enjoy a happy day in one of those glorious country seats for which England is so famous; and a kind and genial feeling is engendered in the hearts of those who are thus supplied with the opportunity of healthful recreation towards those who contribute to their pleasure.

True it is that in towns it is not so easy to make personal influence felt as it is in the country; but combination on the part of influential persons may even there do much. At any rate, it is most desirable that both in town and country wholesome methods of amusement should be set up alongside of those of unwholesome tendency now existing; and that personal influence should be as far as possible exerted in stimulating recourse to the one, and in discouraging resort to the other.

Again, leaving the question of attempts to improve the tone of general holidays, and turning to that of promoting healthful recreation in the vacant hours of the ordinary working day, I would urge the bestowal upon villages as well as towns of play-grounds. Waste grounds in the proximity of villages are now oftentimes enclosed. I have known efforts to get up an evening game at cricket, in the earlier part of the summer season, when the grass is growing for the hay crop, fail from the difficulty of obtaining a field to play in. I believe, then, that if landlords would endow the parishes in which they have property with one single field, out of the broad acres they possess, for the purpose of a parish playground, to which the young men and lads might resort for cricket, football, quoits, or other manly games, they would be conferring an invaluable benefit upon the workpeople

attached to their estates and that where the property is in different hands a union of contributions for such a purpose would be a most useful species of charity. A playfield would prevent the mischief that often arises from the habit of loitering at the idle corner, and would diminish the temptation to turn into the public-house, simply because there is nothing to occupy or amuse, and time hangs heavy on the hand. It ought, in my opinion, to be an invariable appendage to the country town or village.

The only other point to which I can now briefly advert is that of supplying objects of interest for the long winter evening. When the hours of work are over, workpeople will not, as a rule, devote themselves to subjects which are a strain upon the powers of the mind, or required prolonged attention. A conversational style of lecture on some subject of immediate interest to the working classes will occasionally attract an audience. Music, however, is, I believe, that which in the long run will prove the most successful instrument of attraction. The establishment of cheap concerts in towns is a wise and philanthropic measure. In country villages we must trust to the village choir, aided by amateur performers; and when persons of education, who have leisure for cultivating instrumental and vocal powers, will employ their talent in ministering to the enjoyment of those who possess fewer advantages than themselves, the happiest results are produced. When the ladies of the family mansion, and the members of the clergyman's family, lend their aid in giving occasional concerts in the parish school-room, in which I rejoice to say that Yorkshire has set a good example, the hours of a winter's evening are innocently and pleurably spent. Nor do such considerate exertions for the enjoyment of their neighbours fail of abundant reward.

The great remedy for our present social and spiritual evils is, I repeat, sympathy—sympathy not shown merely by words, nor even by gifts, but evidenced by *acts*. The more it appears that those whose lot is cast in the higher circles of the social scale, are giving undeniable proofs of unselfish interest in the welfare and pleasures of the people, the more will there be of contentment, confidence, and goodwill; and the greater will be the signs of respect on the part of the working classes towards those whom Providence has made their natural leaders in all that tends to human happiness here and hereafter.

There is, indeed, abroad a spirit of imaginary patriotism which gathers its monster meetings, which works by appealing to the passions of the people, and by fomenting political discontent, professes to make working people happier, whilst it does nothing to make them better men. But that is pure patriotism, free from all suspicion of selfish aims, and alone worthy of the name, which tries to add to the happiness of the poorer classes, yea and of all classes, by promoting that which will secure their future as well as present welfare—which seeks the purification, the Christianization of the morals, the habits, the tastes, and the enjoyments of the people.

THE HON. AND REV. CANON LYTTTELTON READ THE FOLLOWING PAPER :—

It is, I think, a most satisfactory sign of our times that one of the subjects selected for treatment at this great Church Congress should be that of The Recreations of the People. It is one among many indications that the Church is awake, as she was not some years ago, to the great truth that her mission consists, not only in preparing all men for that great future life to which the grave is the gate, but also in glorifying this present world, and restoring it in all its parts, by the power of Christ, to the state in which it was when, in the beginning, "God saw everything that He had made and behold it was very good." This was not felt, or was most imperfectly realised, by religious men at the beginning of this century. The Church was then possessed by a real Manicheanism, from the effects of which we are still suffering. The work of our Lord in "entering the palace of the strong man armed," not to destroy, but to "*divide*" i.e., to redistribute his goods, and restore each of them to its rightful owner and proper use,—since each has a proper use,—was misinterpreted or overlooked; and so the Church, giving up much of the world as hopelessly evil, or at best contemptible,—believing that though "Heaven" indeed was "full of the Glory of God," "Earth" neither was nor could be made so,—neglected a large and most important part of her mission. With regard to human nature, that truth which Bishop Butler in his "Sermons" so powerfully preached, that every one of the fundamental impulses of that nature is in itself good,—that sinfulness consists not in itself, but in its misdirection,—was forgotten or denied. And with respect to the future life, and right preparation for it, the meaning of the great fact of the Ascension in which we contemplate the Divine Head of our race carrying up into heaven, not a mutilated fragment only of our nature, but the *whole* of that nature, was entirely overlooked; whence great errors in practical religion. For if *all* the pure powers of human nature are thus to be carried into the Eternal Life, then for every one of them there must be exercise of some sort in that life; and therefore it is not the exercise of *some* of our powers, as for instance the passive or contemplative only, which fits and prepares us for heaven, but the right use in the fear and love of God of *all* our powers.

All this bears strictly upon my subject. For till we can clear out of the minds of our working people the notion that a man cannot prepare for another world, till he has done with this; and that the joy, cheerfulness, and high spirits which belong to childhood and youth are, in themselves if not actual sin yet akin with sin, it is vain to hope to bring their minds, in times of recreation, under the control of that fear and love of God, and of that sense of the presence of God and of Christ, which is the only salt that can keep them from corruption.

Now the only effective way of teaching our people the perfect consistency of cheerfulness and mirth with Christian holiness, is *example*. Let men habitually see those whom they know to be really holy men, Christians indeed, joining freely and heartily in lawful amusement. By the presence of such men and women at feasts, better than by any other means, we may hope to see the evil spirit of sensuality and excess banished from them. Let the earnest communicant laity of the church make it a distinct part of their Christian philanthropy to join in the sports and pastimes of the people. And, though we tread upon somewhat dangerous ground when we say that the clergy ought in some way to do the same, and visions far from edifying may rise before our minds of "sporting parsons," *mere* cricketing or still worse *mere croqueting* clergymen, yet it is most desirable that the clergy should not stand altogether aloof from the sports and pastimes of the people. There can be nothing but good in their presence and hearty sympathy with their parishioners at such times, in a brotherly and unpatronising spirit, nor in their actually taking part in them in moderation.

On the vital importance of the Church taking interest in the recreations of the people I am happy to be able to quote some strong words, which will derive weight from the character of the distinguished clergyman who spoke them. Dr. Miller, late of Birmingham, now of Greenwich, has lately said in a sermon, "We hesitate not to affirm in a Christian pulpit, that not only the education of the working classes of the poor, but their recreations are a question of urgent interest and moment. Rather let me correct myself, and say that the provision of recreation is an integral part of the great subject of education. We give the child, not his school only, but his playground. The child of larger growth wants *his* playground. We have forgotten this. We have thought it beneath us. We have provided them work, churches, schools, *but have left it to the devil to find them recreation.*"

I fear there is too much truth in these words of Dr. Miller. Far the larger part of the grosser sins and miseries of our nation has its origin, we all know too well, in those pests of the land, beershops and public-houses, governed as at present they generally are. But it is vain to warn men against them, if we do not offer them at the same time any *alternatives* for them but their own sometimes miserable homes. Therefore to provide club-rooms, workmen's halls, and the like, in which working men may freely enjoy all the harmless outdoor as well as indoor amusements that are to be found in public-houses, without their dangers and excesses, is a work as important and as pressing for the Church—and let me say particularly the rich laity of the Church—to do as any that can be mentioned.

The subject of recreation is enormous, and I can but hint at some of the suggestions I wish to make.

I. First, it is of serious importance that there should be *time enough* allowed for recreation in working men's lives—that holiday times should not be of such rare occurrence, and therefore so exciting as they generally are to our English poor. A holiday comes only once or twice in a year to some of our English working people; and therefore they seem to wish to put as much enjoyment into it

when it does come as can be *packed* into it;—hence all manner of excess. If holidays were more common they would be enjoyed more quietly, and therefore more harmlessly. The Church ought, I think, for these and other reasons, to support and help forward, with all her might, all such moves as those for early closing, and for Saturday half-holidays. This is important in itself. But of course that is not enough.

II. Having made the vacuum we must then bestir ourselves to fill it with the right things, else the house that is empty, swept and garnished, may become the habitation of seven devils worse than the one devil of over-hard work and drudgery which we cast out. But this, by the exertion of good and kindly men may easily be done, as has been most successfully shown in practice by Mr. Erskine Clarke, Mr. Henry Solly, the excellent and able Secretary of the London Working Men's Club Union, and others.

The best and most effective recreation consists not so much in the absence of all work as in *change of work*—the bringing of new mental and bodily muscles into play. As in agriculture we have learnt almost altogether to dispense with the fallow seasons, and to substitute for them a well and scientifically ordered *rotation* of useful crops, and the ground is found to be better refreshed and re-created by this system than by total rest,—so may we learn to do with man's life. Change of occupation may be made to do the work of absolute rest or vacuity. How then can this be attained? How can we hope to bring up a generation that shall have the power of amusing themselves, better than our common English working people do, by *change of work or occupation*.

I answer, first, by more and better directed *education*. This, as it seems to me has not been sufficiently attended to. It is not, I think, common in the work of educating children or adults, to bear distinctly in mind that they will have hereafter not only to work, but also to amuse or recreate themselves, and that if they are to do the latter as well as the former well, they must be prepared and trained for it;—"let alone" being in this, as in other things, "*the devil's watchword*." Nor perhaps has it been distinctly observed that the best training for this purpose is, as I have said, a wide and *many-sided* education. The nation or community that will be best able to amuse themselves rationally and harmlessly, and that will be most likely to avoid the frightful crimes and sins into which so many fall in times of recreation, will be that which has the greatest *variety* of powers of mind and body, and pleasure in the use of them all.

But this is just what, in highly civilised times, manual workers are least likely to get. For in such ages, in order to get manufactured as many things as possible, we limit each workman to some one and that perhaps a very narrow and dull kind of work, which he labours at so continually and monotonously that he can at last do it without the least use of his mind,—merely mechanically; and so is in terrible danger of becoming a mere machine himself.*

* Since writing the above I have been informed that Comte has made, and Ruskin much insisted upon, these very observations upon the mischievous effects of minute subdivisions of labour. I was not aware of it, or should have quoted these great names in support of my remarks.

It is said that the great engineer Brunel, being asked from what nation he would prefer to choose his workmen, answered, the English, because "an Englishman was the only man he knew that would hammer at a nail for twenty-four hours without complaining." Doubtless this shows an indomitable pluck, admirable in its way; but does it not also imply a sad narrowing and mental degradation of the man? It recalls some pathetic words, with which a great philanthropist has brought home to many hearts the sorrows of one class of our hard workers, the milliners, and which apply, I fear, in spirit to many others besides:—

"Work, work, work,
Till the brain begins to swim;
Work, work, work,
Till the eyes are heavy and dim!
Seam, and gusset, and band,
Band, and gusset, and seam,
Till over the buttons I fall asleep,
And sew them on in a dream!"

Is not the whole life of many of our manual workers in danger of becoming, as far as their minds are concerned, a long, heavy sleep, broken only by fever-dreams of wild excitement and intoxication? Now some who believe in what I believe is a most false and mistaken political economy—one which denounces all waste, *except* the most terrible and mischievous of all, the waste of human powers and human happiness—may tell us that this is an inevitable consequence of our enormous population. They say that minute subdivision of labour is indispensable: we *must* substitute dull mechanical "Jacks of one trade" for the free intelligent, and therefore happy "Jacks of all trades," who are in their proper places only in the back woods, which God and not man has made. I cannot believe it. If any system is proved of necessity to cramp and dwarf human beings, it cannot in the end tend to prosperity, or there must be means of guarding against its evils. Let us plead for diminution of the hours of labour, and for greater variety of education and of occupation in times of leisure, for all men. If so-called "Utilitarians" (who sometimes seem to think nothing "useful" but what may be proved to feed the *stomach*) wish to turn this great world which God made so full of manifold and various life, into one enormous *kitchen garden*, let the Church, in the name of charity and of God, reclaim so much of it as she can for *flower gardens*, some for wilderness and free common ground. Surely in the end this will be wiser for all purposes. And if, in consequence of a freer and more humane education some future Robert Burns should sometimes hereafter stop the march of his plough, to sing a song to a daisy which his plough has turned up, or some future Alfred should now and then spoil a cake he had been set to watch, because his mind was set upon other and greater thoughts, surely the happiness that song will express, and the many-sidedness and earnestness of thought which would be shown by that absence of mind, would be cheaply purchased at the cost of a few minute's labour lost in the field, and of a cake or two less admirably cooked.

Now it is perfectly possible to give the children in the first classes of our National Schools a *taste* of a greater variety of knowledge than

is commonly attempted, without in the least sacrificing to this object the due, and I quite allow most needful, worship of the great "Three R.'s," or that general discipline of the powers of the mind which, of course, is the indispensable foundation for all special or secondary education. As experiment is always better than theory, I may be allowed to mention that I have for many years made this my object in my own village school, and have been rewarded with much encouraging success. It was only a few weeks ago that the mother of a boy, of not more than average intelligence, educated in our school, expressed to me her satisfaction at the result of his training there, which was that the boy "took interest in everything," and "had something to say about almost everything he looked at" in common life. This is exactly the result at which we ought to aim. Our object should be to teach children that there are things to be thought about, not only in books (as I fear they often suppose), but also, and still more, in all nature around them. It has been wisely said that the object of intellectual education should be to teach "everything of something, and something of everything;"—a thorough knowledge of some one subject, in order to make the mind perceive what thorough knowledge means, and a little knowledge of as many other subjects as possible, in order to give breadth of intelligence. Set a little snowball of elementary knowledge on many subjects rolling in their minds; it will gather bulk and shape in time, if they happen to have any taste for the kind of thing. Let it be observed that it is not at all necessary for this purpose that the knowledge of these subjects which we give during childhood should be complete, or even very accurate; the point to be aimed at is to give our pupils *a taste for the subjects*, to open their minds to their interest. There are some very wise remarks upon this point in the evidence given by men of science before the Public School Commission. Thus Professor Airy, a man whom no one will charge with mere sciolism, says:—

"I think I may say that a *general acquaintance* with several physical subjects is very desirable, *not for the accuracy of knowledge at the time, but because it does service by giving the mind something to feed on in future, and to hang more knowledge upon.* I remember with gratitude the little electricity I ever learnt when I was a schoolboy; and of course I could learn nothing but the more general rules. *What I have gained of accuracy in everything has been learnt since.*"

Lord Clarendon asks him, "How did you get that knowledge?" to which he replies:—

"By getting some books, or talking with somebody, perhaps, who took an interest in it. I mention this, not as a matter of school-knowledge, but rather as showing that *knowledge acquired at that age, although it is not the subject of intense study, or well-ordered study, does prove to be of value afterwards.*"

"You did not go deep enough into any of these subjects to be termed any training of the mind?"

"No, but just so far as to enable me to seize on the thing afterwards."

A little further on he says:—

"It is astonishing how much the education of the mind comes, not by precise book-studies, but by little things which boys are able to observe, and upon which the mind feeds unconsciously afterwards."

Dr. Hooker, the eminent botanist, says :—

“ Professor Henslow has told me of instances in which girls, whom he had taught botany, had gone out to service afterwards, and in which these qualities of usefulness and intelligence have come out very eminently in them : they have been more useful, and more especially as nursery maids. They have been more agreeable to the children, and more amusing to them. They do not stop and drag the child along, when the child itself stops to look at a flower, a piece of grass, or an insect. They stop too. ‘ So that it really has been useful to the scholars afterwards at service? ’ ‘ Very useful. ’ ”

As to the practicability of giving such instruction in our National Schools, I am able to appeal to experience. In my own village school I have long been in the habit of giving the elder boys and girls some little instruction in the first elements of a few sciences. One year it has been human physiology and the elements of sanitary sciences ; another, elementary and local geology ; and always they have learnt something of drawing, some little carpentering and turning, and gardening ; and we have succeeded without the least difficulty in rousing many of them to a lively interest in these subjects. They stood a very good examination last year in the elements of sanitary science ; and some years ago they were examined by a thoroughly competent examiner in elementary geology, and passed in his opinion very creditably.

It is sometimes most fallaciously assumed that the hour a week, which is devoted to such studies (and that is all we have ever devoted to the teaching of physical science in Hagley School, as it is also all which Professor Owen thinks need be given in public schools,) is wasted as far as the “ three R.’s ” are concerned. The truth is, as my own experience at Hagley, and that of Professor Henslow at Hitcham,—and, I doubt not, many other instances might be added,—abundantly demonstrate, that the diversion of the time and energy that would have been given to the mere drudgery of the “ three R.’s ” to these other subjects, is much more than compensated by the increased power of mind for reading and writing, as well as for every other work, which is the consequence of the greater breadth of intelligence, the greater liveliness of mind, the keener pleasure in the use of the mind—in short, the *gymnasticising* and stimulating of all mental powers, which is the fruit of such studies.

In some foreign countries such instruction is given in all schools. At Ems in Nassau I found that some instruction in botany, a very little in geology, and some systematic instruction in the “ science or art of observation,” form a regular part of the education given to all working people. The interest taken by the children in these lessons (which were given by their schoolmasters) was very lively, as it is obvious it always will be, if such lessons are tolerably well given. Such knowledge commends itself more or less to all minds. And the result was that such labourers, for instance, or miners, as I happened to meet, and to get into conversation with at Ems, were found very much awake to the interests of all such knowledge. Were these men the worse labourers for such education ? Evidently quite the contrary ; and most certainly they were far the happier and most civilized men,

and the more likely to occupy themselves with pure and elevating, rather than brutalizing, pleasures and amusements.

Briefly, then, with regard to Education, our aim should be to cultivate human nature as a whole and in *all* its powers—bodily, mental, and spiritual. We have too much neglected physical or bodily education. We have forgotten that it is part of the fixed and unalterable law of nature that some men in all classes of society should be what may be called *out-door* men. Many men seem to believe that all that is necessary to turn all working men into book-students, and lovers of much reading, is more mental education. They must have overlooked a large and in many cases highly estimable and valuable body of our fellow-countrymen—the country Squires. Some of these gentlemen have had a first-rate education at school and college, and yet are scarcely ever seen to open any printed document except a newspaper or a magazine, and that seldom. A story is told of one of this class of men who was a friend of that eminent man of literature, Bishop Hurd. The bishop asked him how he could bear his life without books? What do you do on a rainy day? asked the bishop. “Put on a great coat,” was the answer. And so there doubtless will always be in all classes, and especially among the class of manual workers, what I have called out-door men, whom no amount of artificial training will ever turn into students. It does not at all follow that nothing can be done with them in the way of mental training. Surely we ought to enter into the pursuits and tastes to which their nature impels them. Help them, for instance, to read with greater intelligence that great Book of Nature at which their eyes will always be looking, and aim at cultivating and developing to the utmost perfection those powers which they do delight in using—their physical ones. Gymnastics and drilling ought, I think, to be much more used in education. The Volunteer movement is doing the nation invaluable service in this as in other ways. It leads to much recreation of a very useful kind. It is much to be wished that the whole English nation might be drilled, as the whole Prussian nation is. Whatever develops the bodily powers, and so promotes health, is found, I believe, also to promote morality, as it certainly does happiness, cheerfulness, and good temper. No doubt what are sometimes called the nobler senses—sight and hearing—should be cultivated rather than the other and less noble, which may be left to nature. Drawing ought to be taught in all schools to train the eye, and music to train the ear; gymnastics to develope and discipline the whole body; carpentering, turning, wood-carving, and gardening are also very useful. One advantage of such general cultivation is that by means of it we may lay hold of all the different kinds of human beings. If we wish to catch all the fish in our pools, we must not fish, as is so often done, only with one kind of fly for which we may happen ourselves to have a preference, but with many; and let them be played on the surface of the pools by skilful and experienced fishermen, with due regard to the state of the weather and the nature of the fish they intend to catch.

III. My subject is distressingly large. I can but touch large portions of it.

I might speak of Lectures. They might, I think, be made more

useful, and therefore also more attractive, by combining them more wisely with other means of education. As, for instance, a course might be given through a winter, preparatory to, and explanatory of, Excursions to be made in the spring and summer, so as to give those who attend them a more intelligent appreciation of the beauty and interest of the country through which they will travel. Or lectures may be given on books lately added to a Lending Library, drawing attention to their merits and attractions, and so doing the same service for working people in their reading that Reviews do for us. Again, Horticultural and Agricultural Shows, enlightening country people in the right cultivation of their own gardens, and in the principles of their daily work, are also most useful; particularly if those shows could be illustrated, as was successfully done by Professor Henslow at Hitcham, by what he termed "*Lecturets*," explaining the several objects exhibited, in popular style. But of all means of amusement devised for working people, perhaps the best are Industrial Shows. Their great advantage is that they promote fire-side amusement through many months in preparing for them. They have been attended with great and very promising success in country villages, as well as in large towns. I believe the first clergyman who attempted one in a country place was Mr. Blackwell, of Amberley, in Gloucestershire. A Gloucester paper, speaking of the Amberley Exhibition, says, "The result has been wonderful. During the last six months nearly every cottage has been the nightly scene of work for this Exhibition. Men, women, and children have been busy; and men, let us add, who, there is too much reason to fear, would ordinarily have spent their evenings in a public-house. And there has been a curious reversal of labour; for weavers have done carpenters' work, and the industry of others has taken a direction equally strange." In this way such shows tend to the desirable result for which I have been pleading—they turn a whole population into "*Jacks of all trades*." A very successful show has been held at Whitnash, and another with excellent effect at Hagley.

IV. Finally, I would say that the highest object at which we can aim with respect to Recreation is to *turn a man's work as far as possible into recreation*, by so educating his mind and body as to make his work a pleasure to him. The use of the treadmill has been given up in prisons, because it is found that to make men work at that of which they cannot see the use, is to demoralize them by disgusting them with work altogether. But that which has been abolished in prisons, holds its ground, I fear, too literally in England outside of prisons. A very large part of all manual work that is done is turned into a treadmill of lifeless drudgery and slavery, by being done with no understanding of the principle by which it ought to be directed, or of the great object it is meant to subserve. Our principles must be to put an end to this state of things by giving all men some amount of professional as well as general education; by combining a seventh part of rest (school, *i.e.* σχολή, or leisure for thought or education) with every six parts of active labour; and by teaching men, in that seventh part, to enjoy the Divine pleasure of *seeing* how all work that is done in God and for God is indeed "*very good*." Every man who is to work in the fields ought to know something of the first elements of botany and

agriculture (as is done in Germany); every man who works in mines something of geology; and every man whose business is with machinery the first elements of mechanics. In the middle ages the Freemasons lived in their "lodges" with some great architect or master-builder, who taught them their craft, and from whom they caught something of his own enthusiasm for it. Hence the nobleness, the beauty, the freedom of their work. Cannot advantages of a similar nature be contrived for workers of our day, by bringing them more into intercourse with the master-minds of their craft? It may be possible so to direct the recreations of men as to make them throw light upon their work, and to open their minds to the glory and meaning of every part of their life, and so to bring pleasure into all common work. "Penny Readings," rightly selected, may guide men to good books to read at home. The best music being selected for public entertainments,—village concerts and the like—may be made to cultivate and encourage a taste for the best music at all times. The sight of pictures by great masters may interpret to men the glory and beauty of every common sight of Nature, and teach them to see these things with something of an artist's eye. Books giving high views of any work ennoble it to the hearer or reader afterwards, and so leads to a higher and satisfying pleasure in it.

It should be our highest end and object to turn all men's work into their best recreation, by teaching them its principles, its meaning and objects, and giving them the utmost skill in executing it. So does all work become a pleasure that is intelligently done, in the spirit of a freeman not of a slave, when sufficient school-time (*σχολή*, or leisure) is given to study its principles and enjoy its perfection, so as to see how it fits into the great scheme of things which the great Father of all has appointed for the good of all His creatures.

DISCUSSION.

Colonel AKROD, M.P. : It is not easy to say anything new or interesting to a general audience upon the social condition of the people. The subject has been much discussed of late by politicians as well as philanthropists, and is worn somewhat threadbare. Yet it is one which ought to interest us all. Each of us comes more or less in contact with the poorer classes: each of us has some influence for good or for evil as we may use it, and duties and responsibilities proportionate to that influence. My point of view will, in some respects, present a different picture to that offered by the reverend gentlemen who have preceded me; for whilst they speak of the labourers in rural districts, my remarks will apply to the factory workers in my own neighbourhood, amongst whom I have lived all my life, and with many of whom I am connected in the relation of employer and employed. The subject proposed naturally divides itself into two branches, the social condition, and the recreations of the poorer classes, by whom I take for granted is meant the labouring class. These two branches are closely connected, seeing that recreations are a fair criterion of the social condition of the people. When amusements are coarse and brutal in their nature, like the bull baiting and bear baiting of a past age, then will the people themselves be coarse and brutal. Advancing civilisation has condemned these sports, but dog fighting and cock fighting are not altogether abandoned in some localities, and, where indulged in, betray a low degree of education and intelligence. In fact the social condition of the people, and the character of their recreations depend mainly upon their education, their intelligence, and their habits of life. The present state of our factory population,

as contrasted with its former condition, clearly illustrates this principle, and perhaps I cannot more usefully employ the short time allowed me than by giving you a sketch of the beneficial change effected in the social well being of the operatives under the provisions of the Factory Act:—Primarily by a limitation of the working hours to ten daily for adults, and half time work with half time schooling for children from the age of 8 to 13 years; and, secondarily, by institutions to which I will shortly refer, compatible only with a sound elementary education and moderate leisure. Before the passing of the Factory Act, all who worked in factories—men, women, and children—were kept at work usually for twelve hours daily, irrespective of meal hours, and occasionally much longer, even to the very extreme of physical exhaustion. Reading and writing were rare acquirements, only to be got at in Sunday Schools. Leisure there was none, save during a depression of trade, or when the mills were unable to run. Need I add that without education, without recreation, the social condition of the people was in a wretched state, and rapidly deteriorating. The Factory Act was passed in 1833, thanks to the devoted labours of Richard Oastler, Lord Ashley, now Lord Shaftesbury, and others. It passed, amidst great excitement on the part of the operatives, and persistent opposition from the mill-owners, not so much from unwillingness to contract the hours of labour, as from a sense of injustice that they alone amongst the employers of labour should be singled out for special legislation. This injustice is being remedied by the gradual though slow extension of the Factory Act, which I have long advocated; and I agree with Professor Fawcett in the hope that the extension, with such modification as may be necessary, may ultimately embrace all juvenile workers in this country, including those in rural districts. When the Factory Act passed the second reading in the House of Commons I witnessed the debate, and never shall I forget the sense of shame and humiliation with which I listened to the reproaches heaped upon mill-owners, and to the manifestation of bitter animosity by the work-people against their employers, whom they considered as their task-masters. It was then for the first time the truth dawned upon me that the duties of an employer were more comprehensive than I had previously understood them to be; and that if ever the affections of work-people could be won by their employer, it must be by proofs of sympathy and kindness on his part, and by efforts out of the routine of their business relations to promote the comfort and happiness of the employed. I then resolved to make the attempt, and am grateful for the response I have met with, and the success which has attended my efforts. By your permission we will cast a rapid glance at the appliances by which the social well-being of the people in my parish has been raised, and the means of healthy recreation placed within their reach. The first step taken towards a better state of things was the erection of day schools. The one in my own neighbourhood at Haley Hill, Halifax, a large, commodious room, was built in 1839, and has been the centre round which have clustered many other institutions in the parish. The compulsory attendance of children under the half-time system to the age of 13 years, with alternations of school, recreation, and work, has filled the schools with a set of industrious, healthy children. Besides the day schools there are the usual infant schools; also a working men's college and a young women's institute, with evening classes. Herein lies the advantage which factory districts possess over rural districts, and upon this broad foundation of elementary teaching and early training has been based a goodly superstructure of social amelioration. Allotment gardens are admirably suited to a factory population. They help to make the pot boil, and serve both for purposes of domestic economy and out-door recreation. Early on a spring morning, or a summer evening, it is a pleasant sight to see the mill-workers digging their gardens and inhaling the fresh air. Haley Hill Allotment Garden Society was formed upwards of twenty years ago: there is an annual show with presentation of prizes and a tea drinking. The show is hailed as the annual feast of the locality. A Penny Savings' Bank is a great help to a poor man, and one should be opened in every parish, irrespective of Post-Office Banks. It assists the economic training of youth, and the formation of habits of saving, which will secure comfort and abundance in after life. In Haley Hill one has been opened for many years, and has proved a blessing to the neighbourhood. Recreations may be classified under two heads: those adopted for open air in the summer, and those for in-doors during the winter. Under the former head come games of cricket, quoits, bowls, &c., and for these the Haley Hill Recreation Club offers every facility in a suitable piece of ground. In connexion with the Haley Hill Literary and Scientific Association, there are botanical and geological classes, which excursionise during the summer for the collection of specimens. Under winter amusements come the concerts and oratorios given by Haley Hill Choral Society. Also lectures, penny readings, and soirees of

different societies. A news and reading room, where smoking is allowed, constituting a sort of working men's club room, is highly prized by the working classes, and a good cheap circulating library is a most useful adjunct. These have been introduced with great advantage at Haley Hill—the library for many years past. A circulating library has this special recommendation, that it offers an attraction for the fire-side, and induces young people to stay at home instead of gadding about. “As the homes so the people,” is an axiom in social science, and the way to improve the one is to improve the other. There is no surer method of increasing the comfort and happiness of the people, than by finding them comfortable, healthy dwellings. Men in the receipt of high wages, however, who are uneducated, sometimes prefer a hovel at a low rent to a better house with a higher rent which they can well afford. Improved education, therefore, should precede or accompany the erection of better habitations—an object which has not been overlooked at Haley Hill. In this hasty review of various social institutions, it would be unjust to working men to be silent about their sick and benefit clubs for relief in sickness and after death, and to omit reference to the secret orders of Odd Fellows and other kindred societies. Following the excellent example of the Dean of Chichester, I have had the honour of being enrolled an Odd Fellow, and I can speak in high terms of admiration and respect for the able manner in which the affairs of the various lodges are conducted, and for the sound principles of order and obedience to law and constituted authority which are inculcated amongst the members. I consider it a privilege to be associated with artisans in such societies, and to work *with* them, not *for* them only—a point not to be lost sight of in any plan promoted by the middle classes for the welfare of their poorer brethren. Amongst other civilising agencies at work with the present generation, cheap railway excursions deserve honourable mention. The wider view which they give of the world in which we live, and the enlarged observation of men and manners, have a gradual but sure influence in softening and humanising the individual. It would be tedious to dwell longer upon these various social organisations. The roseate tint which they throw upon society has its darker shades. The ale-house possesses separate charms, although I have nothing to say against a well conducted ale-house, where the publican takes a pride in having what he calls a respectable house. There are also decent beer-houses, but there are others so bad that they are moral pest houses, which nothing less than legislative enactment, by an improvement in the licensing system, can reach. In such houses, or elsewhere, gambling amongst the youth of the working class is practised to a deplorable extent. Thus two converse agencies are at work on society as on individuals, one tending to raise, the other to depress the moral condition. The rate of wages I have not touched upon. In the factory districts there has been a steady, gradual rise, without strikes, a pleasing fact, which reflects equal credit upon those who receive and those who pay wages. Advances in the rate of wages, unless accompanied by corresponding providence and forethought, are often a curse instead of a blessing to a working man, tempting him to idleness and self-indulgence in bad habits, instead of the accumulation of his earnings to meet the wants of sickness and old age. In this great work of social progress and improvement, the Church of England has a glorious part to perform. She enjoys peculiar privileges in her parochial subdivisions, in her diocesan supervision; but, excellent as is her parochial organisation, it has this disadvantage, that whilst the machinery of one parish may be perfect, that of the adjoining one may be deficient. This inequality can be overcome only by a general and systematic effort on a wider scale, for which deaneries and archdeaconries offer facilities. Overburdened as the clergy often are with their clerical duties, laymen must bear their share in this work, and, when well and faithfully done, all classes and ranks of society will be bound together in the bonds of Christian charity and brotherly love.

Rev. W. CAINE : I have lived in Manchester for the last twelve years, and therefore claim to know something of the social condition of the masses in our large towns, and, with your permission, I will say a few words upon what I believe to be one of the remedies for the present depressing state of things. The majority in this assembly will agree with me in almost all I shall say, but if in some opinions I should be in a minority, I hope you will all follow the advice of his Grace the President, and not give me unreasonable opposition. The working classes of this country are labouring under fearful disadvantages. They are surrounded on every side by the most fearful temptations which, if they surrounded the higher classes, would cause many more respectable people to fall into grievous sin. In Manchester, for instance, the people are groaning under the number of public houses and beer shops. The late Rev. John Clay, the respected chaplain of Preston Gaol, in words that ought to be known by

this assembly, said that the working people, when they came into prison, always lamented the number of temptations by which they were surrounded, and used to say they wished beer was 10s. a quart, so that they might not be led to drink that which caused them so much misery. I was exceedingly anxious to take part in the discussion on the due observance of the Lord's Day, because it is between Saturday night and Monday morning that the principal amount of crime is committed in this country. In a little tract which I hold in my hand I have the words of the Rev. George Hamilton, chaplain of Durham Gaol, and he said that half of the crime of the country was committed between Saturday afternoon and Monday morning, and in these cases almost every offence is directly or indirectly connected with the public-house or beer-shop. The late venerated Canon Stowell, who laboured in Manchester for more than thirty years, made this solemn declaration, speaking so strongly that I, although a teetotaler of some thirty years standing, am afraid to read them because they may possibly give offence to this assembly. Canon Stowell, who was not himself a teetotaler, said "that dark and damnable traffic turns the day of God almost into a day of Satan, and makes it questionable whether for the masses of the people it would not be better to have no Sunday at all." I quite agree with that. It would be better for thousands of our artisans if they were working in their mills and factories on the Lord's Day rather than ruining themselves in public houses and beer shops. It was only yesterday a gentleman, well acquainted with the working classes of Manchester, told me that the railway excursions on the Sunday were of the greatest possible benefit to the people of that city, because they took them away from the low public houses, and brought them face to face with the glorious scenes of nature, where they might behold the wonderful works of God, instead of grovelling in their filthy habits in the public houses. Let me tell you something of the social condition of these towns. I hold in my hands evidence given before a committee of the House of Lords, and it tells me that in Southwark 68 per cent. of the people attend no place of worship; in Lambeth, under the very shadow of the venerable primate's palace, 60 per cent. of the people never attend a place of worship; in Sheffield 62 per cent.; in Salford 52 per cent.; in Manchester 51 per cent. And permit me to express the opinion that the chief cause of the absence of the people from the House of God is the public houses. I can say from my own personal experience that the real wishes and desires of the working classes are, that they might be freed from the many temptations that surround them. I have here a remarkable piece of statistics, showing that in the poorer districts of our large towns nineteen out of every twenty of the people are anxious to be preserved from these temptations; and the poor women, the wives of the artisans, say they would sign papers a thousand times asking Members of Parliament to suppress these public houses by Act of Parliament. And allow me to say in this most influential assembly, that some blame must be attached to our magistrates for granting public-house licenses far too freely. These very magistrates who grant public-house licenses, and place the houses amongst the poor so freely, would not have one such house in their own immediate neighbourhood. After the admirable paper read to-day with regard to the due observance of the Lord's Day, I cannot understand how any one can approve of having public houses opened on that day, while the shops of butchers and bakers are obliged to be closed. Permit me to observe that this is not a teetotal question at all: it is a question that has to do with the due observance of the Lord's Day. If people say they want beer on Sunday why should they not get it bottled on the Saturday night? I say it is a disgrace to a Christian community to have these places opened on the Lord's Day, as the only trade that is allowed by law to exercise its ordinary work on a day that should be devoted to the worship of God. Permit me to ask you as clergymen, and to entreat the heads of our church, to be earnest in this movement if they wish to attach the masses of the people to ourselves. I can say from my own personal knowledge that the nonconformists are far in advance of us in social questions, and I also—(the bell here warned the speaker that his time had expired).

MR. POWELL, M.P.: The brief space of ten minutes which by the wise rules of the Congress are allotted to every speaker, will compel me to compress into the briefest compass what I have to say to you upon this question, and my thoughts must therefore be given to you in the rudest outline. I believe there is no country of Western Europe whose position is so lamentable as that of England with reference to its provision for the amusement and recreation of the people in large towns. In France we find a much better state of things. In great metropolitan Paris, in the inferior towns, even in the remote villages, there will be found some centre where the people might congregate, partly to saunter and enjoy the fine fresh air of heaven and partly to inter-

change thoughts and ideas. In this country there is a sadly and painfully different condition of things. In London there are no doubt, the great parks, and in other places certain spaces for recreation are springing up. It is said public opinion is becoming more and more alive to the necessity of movement, but I fear the life is sluggish, and requires wakening with fresh energy. I greatly regret that an effort made during the last session of Parliament to facilitate the exercise of privileges, that might be used to give increased fresh air and recreation to the people, with respect to the Commons near the large towns, unhappily failed. I hope the time will shortly arrive when the town youth of England will no longer be driven to an uncertain conflict on the spaces where the country is retreating, and the town advancing with the brick-setter, plasterer, and surveyor. There ought to be in connexion with our large towns ample places where the young men can invigorate their frames and indulge in manly competition so beneficial to the muscular system, and so conducive to that grand spirit of emulation which always exists when it is known that the best man will win. I hope a renewed effort will be made ere long to bring about so desirable a state of things, and that there will be hearty competition for the best, without that jealousy which often leads to the triumph of the worst. There is another mode of greatly improving the condition of our people for which the Legislature has afforded great facilities, viz. :—the multiplication of baths and wash-houses, and the calling into existence a larger number of free libraries for mental enjoyment and culture. No subject is more painful and difficult than that of the hours of labour. In the large factories and workshops these hours might be regulated and controlled, but I doubt whether any such system could operate in the rooms where such work-people as sempstresses and artificial flower-makers are employed. The one thing that ought to be done is what the Legislature has already sanctioned—namely, the regulation of the overcrowding. Another difficult and delicate point touching the question is the domiciliary condition of the people. In the past, owing to many difficulties in the law, mischiefs had existed for the removal of which no machinery was provided. Various processes are, however, now supplied, and others will no doubt be forthcoming. What I would desire to say at this critical stage of the anxious controversy is “Take heed lest you march too fast; don’t go so far with sanitary reform that you rouse the opposition of the landlord, or the suspicion and dislike of the tenant.” What we want in this, as in all social reforms, is not merely the sanction, but the co-operation of the people.

REV. J. T. LONDON : I am extremely unwilling to intrude upon you at this period of the evening, but there is one point which it strikes me has not been sufficiently touched upon, and it is one we should never forget ourselves or allow others to forget, as Lord Shaftesbury said,—and that is the condition of the dwelling-houses of the poor. Little can be done for their social or moral improvement so long as the poor live together crowded in small houses, too often, I regret to say from the experience I have had as a member of the board of guardians, without any regard to health or decency. In my district I have found that where there is a filthy habitation there is generally a filthy family to occupy it. So long as people are brought up together—fathers and mothers, and grown up children of both sexes occupying the same room—what hope is there we shall find any delicacy of feeling, and any such habits as will promote the amelioration of the condition of those who need so much improvement? The great object for which we should agitate among our friends and landowners, is to improve the cottages of the poor people, and take care that decency at any rate be observed as regards the number of rooms, in proportion to the number of persons inhabiting the cottage. I know it is a most difficult subject to deal with, because if the clergyman takes it up strongly he offends those whom it is his best policy and duty, as far as it lies in his power, to be on the best of terms with. It is, I think, a point on which the Legislature might assist us. Supposing inspectors of position and impartiality could be employed to prevent overcrowding, and to see that decency is observed at least with regard to the occupation of the rooms, that would be a great advantage. Whatever amusements we may afford, whatever education we may give, until we begin at the root of the evil, and put persons in a position to be decent, I am afraid that “the filthy will be filthy still.”

LORD TEIGNMOUTH : I should very sorry if the thanks of this meeting were not tendered on behalf of the laymen to the authors of the papers who have so ably dealt with subjects of such great importance as those we have been considering. Whatever else we may do I am sure we may do as the Social Science Congress at Manchester has done—tell upon public opinion and endeavour to come to some practical conclusion as to the matters that are dealt with. I will not speak of the various amusements

that have been referred to, because nothing could have been better than the treatment they have received in the papers. Let me briefly point out the great blot of our system, and consider what is the best mode of dealing with the evil. With regard to the state of these great towns I was sorry and surprised to hear the statement made by a gentleman who has just spoken, as to the almost impossibility of dealing with the sanitary condition of the people. I am sure, if he had seen what I chanced to see last night of the city of Manchester, he would not have come to that conclusion. It so happened I had the opportunity of spending four hours last night in going round with six or seven gentlemen of the Social Science Congress, escorted as it was necessary to be by some of the police officers, to some of the worst spots of the town. We visited the quarters of the vagrants, then the houses of the thieves, and then the burglars, witnessing scenes of vice too bad to be described. It is a great many years ago since I visited Manchester, supplied with an introduction from Lord Shaftesbury. At that time it was a city of warehouses: now it is a city of palaces that will vie with any other in the kingdom in luxury. What is the state of the lower classes? I will describe one of the houses, a sample of nearly all we visited. You go first into a room where there is a large fire burning: that is the kitchen, where the heat is so intense that you can hardly breathe. There were there squalid, wretched looking creatures, men, women, and children. On going up-stairs we found, in each room, as many beds as it could hold: we counted several times four persons in a bed. There was scarcely one room in which there was a light: there were no lavatories: no ventilation. I asked these gentlemen of the police—they were two of the most trusty men—how they managed, and the reply was “We positively don’t know what to do: we would put a ventilator into the top of the ceiling, but it would be stopped up.” Here is an evil of the most dangerous kind. If you were to see what the state of these creatures is—men, women, and children—you would ask if it were possible to restrain the hand of legislation, and not applaud Lord Shaftesbury for what he has done or attempted? Now let me come to the drinking. These were not licensed houses. They were beer-shops. But do you think there were no spirits there? The police told me these people were constantly smuggling in spirits, and that drink was the bottom of all this misery. I really feel exceedingly obliged to Canon Randolph for his remarks upon this licensing question. Only consider against what tremendous odds we wage war against intemperance! Let me beseech you to do all you can here and elsewhere to work upon the public mind, and compel the Legislature by a wholesome and perpetual agitation to take the matter up. Why should we leave agitation to radicals and seditious persons? Let us put our hands like honest men and patriots upon the lever of public opinion. The difficulties the magistrates have to contend with are of the most complicated kind. In the first place we receive testimonials in favour of the applicant for a license. What are those testimonials worth? I do not scruple to say I would not give a fig for such testimonials. I know what they are. You talk of political corruption in our boroughs: I speak of the moral corruption with which our clergy and laity are infected by this accursed system. Testimonials are worth nothing. We meet as magistrates in petty sessions: the applicant is backed by his landlord, and I know of an instance where a poor man came to me over-night about a license which he had been forced by his landlord to ask for—no rare instance. Then there is the wealthy brewer working at him from another point, and there is the rich dealer in spirits who is pressing upon him from another quarter. Such is the competition in this matter of drink, that the man is obliged to do everything in his power to attract men to his particular public-house. In fact, a man sometimes drinks himself to death to keep up competition. I blame the magistrates: I admit they are sometimes wrong. Human nature is human nature everywhere: it has its weaknesses, and human nature is jesuitical upon the bench as well as elsewhere. A great deal of pressure is brought to bear on them, and they sometimes grant licenses without rhyme or reason in violation of their duty. This was done the other day by the great town of Liverpool, who abrogated their duty, and renounced the responsibility which the Legislature has cast upon them. They got out of their difficulties by what is resorted to, honestly or hypocritically, on pretext about free trade, and gave licenses to every one that asked them. This was done by the town of Liverpool, and what is the retribution? I have the statistics. As the public-houses increased, the competition increased, and the drunkenness increased; and a few days ago, partly from honesty—for Englishmen will come round at last—and partly also from a sense of shame, they cancelled their former proceedings, and have told the people of England that the free trade system of licensing public-houses will never do.

Mr. POWELL, M.P.: Lord Teignmouth has evidently misunderstood what I said on Sanitary Reform. I have long laboured for it, and I hope to labour long and hard in the same direction for many years to come. I believe every evil which has been pointed out can be remedied under the powers of statutes now in force. If the powers existing are not sufficient for the purpose—let them be made stronger still.

The Rev. T. MYERS: we are turning, I am afraid, a little into a Social Science Conference, and I would recall the meeting to one point, namely, that we are members of the Christian Church, and that our great duty is to uphold the doctrines of our Lord and Master, and to bring spiritual light upon all these moral and social evils. Having considered these social subjects I am well aware of the various moral diseases which have been pointed out; but I feel quite sure, from much experience, that the only remedy which Christian men can uphold is the Gospel of our Lord and Saviour. Whatever view you may take of the Gospel,—whether you take it in the good old fashion in which some of us were brought up, or not; I do really and truly believe the more you can act upon men's immortal souls,—the more you can bring them under the powers of the world to come—the more you can set before them the great truth that it is appointed unto all men once to die, and after death the judgment,—the better will both clergy and laymen be discharging their own duties to our Church, as well as to our country. Without, in any way, throwing the slightest slur upon these valuable and practical remedies that have been pointed out, I believe it to be our duty, as well as our privilege, to go forth with our Master's message in our Master's name, in season and out of season, to carry out the great principles of the revealed religion which we profess, according to the order, the discipline, and the privileges of our own Apostolic Church. Although we may do much in secular education, and in all those appliances which are so useful and proper, and in which some of you have taken such an active part, still we must rely upon the blessing of our Heavenly Father; we must pray for the influence of God's Holy Spirit; and we must not expect that any of these practical social measures will succeed, without the guidance and inspiration of that Blessed Comforter, who has promised to teach and lead us into all truth. I only rise to give a more spiritual tone to the meeting, and will therefore now give way to other speakers.

The Rev. Canon ATLEY: It is far from my wish to say one word which would diminish the effect of the very striking remarks just offered to us; but, at the same time, I think I may properly recall the attention of this assembly to the fact that we are now discussing the social condition and recreations of the poorer classes. It is, they say, an ill bird that fouls its own nest; and coming here to night, as I do, from a great town, and having a few words to say upon its condition, I hope I shall not be in the condition of that ill bird, and foul the nest from which I have come. Still, when I see it stated, as many of my hearers may have seen it also, that gentlemen of weight in Leeds have publicly asserted that they would far rather sleep in a pig-sty than in many of the human habitations there; if there be ground for such an assertion, and that in my own town, then at all events, some steps should be taken to improve the moral and social condition of the people. Threatened, as we are, with the visitation of the Cholera, it becomes of the greatest consequence to do all that lies in our reach, by actually promoting personal cleanliness among the poorer classes, to bring about what would be really and truly an improvement in their social condition. I entirely agree with Colonel Akroyd, that until you have educated up the people to living in better habitations, it is very little use providing those habitations for them. I could tell of persons dwelling in the most wretched cellars, who have had the opportunity of living in habitations more fitted for Christian families, and who yet have been so accustomed to live in squalor and filth, that they would not exchange them for happier and more seasonable homes. And until our great employers of labour, and the squires in our agricultural villages, and our great merchants are awakened to a sense of their responsibility in the matter, and have recognised that the building of cottages and houses never ought to be looked upon only from a mere pecuniary point of view—until they are thoroughly convinced that it is their duty towards those with whom God has brought them into contact, so as to educate them, not merely by reading, writing, and arithmetic, but by that sympathy of which we have heard so much—by mixing in their amusements, and showing them that they have an interest in their moral welfare;—until this has come to pass, we shall not find our poorer classes, as they are called, likely to avail themselves of opportunities admirable indeed in themselves but not appreciated by those within whose reach we place them. It is with a firm conviction in my own mind that whatever we may say and do in a Congress like this is of very little importance, except we bring an influence to bear upon public opinion and awaken it, that I have ventured to offer to you these few observations.

MR. JAMES LORD: I wish to make a few remarks upon this most important subject. It was admitted on all hands at the Social Science Congress at Manchester, that better house accommodation was required for our poor brethren, and many plans were spoken of; but the chief difficulty was the want of funds to provide dwellings for the working classes. Many years ago we took great interest in London in building model lodging houses of a most admirable description, but we could not then construct them upon such a principle as to make them so remunerative to the capitalists as to induce them to invest their money. It has been since then suggested that application should be made to Parliament for money at 3 or 3½ per cent. but the question was asked "What right have you to apply to Parliament for public money for those private purposes?" Allow me to throw out a suggestion. We have in Lancashire co-operative societies, in which working men have saved among themselves money which they have applied by the co-operative principle to buy provisions, and even to work mills, retaining the whole profits themselves. Working men, in various parts of the country, might, if they chose, carry out this co-operative principle in another way, and instead of accumulating their earnings in Savings' Banks, where they can get but a small per centage, they might join in a society to build houses and divide all the profits amongst themselves.

REV. T. A. STOWELL: I cannot but feel that the subject we are discussing is thoroughly in keeping with the teaching of the Gospel of Christ. I read there that at the last day it shall be said "I was sick and ye came unto me; I was in prison and ye visited me;" and the social condition of our people, if not the most spiritual question that can come before us, is not devoid of interest to any Christian man. I wish to speak a very few minutes as to what I am convinced lies at the very root of the social evils of our people, impeding all we desire to do in a social, sanitary, and spiritual way, for the amelioration of the condition of the working classes. We have numbers of our people living in large towns in wretched dwellings, where comfort, health and decency, are utterly impossible; houses that are the fruitful hotbed of disease, crime, drunkenness, immorality, and that spread abroad in the neighbourhood where they are situated, physical and moral pestilence. This is a matter that concerns all Christian men and women. Lazarus lies at our gate. Are we to pass him by? Is it a matter of no concern to us that people are living in holes where a merciful man would not place his beast? It is said, "educate the people to learn the value of good habitations;" but these evil dwellings, of which I have spoken, are, even now, counteracting all our efforts to educate them. Somebody then says, "give the people good wages and they will provide for themselves better houses." I have had some experience in a town in his Lordship's diocese, and I know men whose families are bringing in two or three pounds a week, and who care not to live in better houses than such a one as contains only one sleeping room for a grown up family. I will take the town of Bradford. There was a bye-law passed there that no back to back houses should be allowed. The consequence was the building trade stagnated, and instead of having people living in back-to-back houses no more houses were built, and you had sometimes three families in one house. Nothing whatever but some legislative enactment will avail to reach the root of this crying evil. This cannot be otherwise than a matter of interest to this Congress. You must have power given to local authorities with perhaps an inspector from Government, to order the immediate removal of blocks of houses unfit for human habitation, or which are closing up courts, and hindering the circulation of free air. For this compensation should be given to landlords, from money lent by Government at 3½ per cent on security of the local rates. We shall never arrive at a proper state until (although the idea may be somewhat Utopian) a house, like an omnibus, is licensed to hold so many and no more. A certain cubic space should be allowed for each inmate, and there should be, at least, three rooms in every family house, namely, one for the parents, one for the sons, and a third for the daughters. I am convinced no private benevolence or individual speculation will do this: legislation alone can effect the work.

THE RIGHT REV. CHAIRMAN: Before closing the meeting I wish simply to endorse every statement we have heard with regard to the importance of attending as a primary question to the condition of the dwellings of the poor. It is clearly the case that our first object should be to promote their spiritual welfare, but I do assure you that the social condition of the poor, in connexion with the dwellings in which they reside, does underlie every question relating to their spiritual interests. I speak thus from experience. For many years I had charge of one of the vast metropolitan parishes, in which there was a large number of poor inhabitants, and the majority of them lived in circumstances which I do not

hesitate to state rendered it almost impossible for them to be moral, much less religious. I could go to houses in that parish where several families occupied one room; where parents and grown-up sons and daughters used the same sleeping apartment; where there was no ventilation and none of the appliances for habits of self-respect. How, then, was it possible these persons should know anything of common morality? And whilst we were not wanting in efforts for the spiritual welfare of these people, carried on by individual labours of lay agents, whom we employed for the express purpose of going on a spiritual mission to their houses, our experience resulted in this:—That so long as the people continued to live in such physical circumstances unchanged and unaltered, all our efforts were paralysed, and the first sign of good being done was when any one who had been spoken to by one of our lay agents for his spiritual welfare awoke, as by the instinct of self-preservation, to the consciousness of the peril in which he was placed, and bestirred himself to get out of the habitation in which he lived. While I entirely sympathise with the views expressed by Mr. Myers, that our first object is to promote by God's blessing the spiritual welfare of the poorer classes, we never ought to forget that men must cease to do evil before they can learn to do well. The first step towards the achievement of the object we most desire—their spiritual and moral improvement—must be to put their dwellings in such a state as to render it possible for them to exercise the duties of common morality. This is a subject of the greatest possible interest, I think we have reason to thank the speakers who have addressed us: and I feel sure we shall one and all depart from this room thankful we have had the opportunity of hearing the question so ably discussed.

The Right Rev. Prelate then pronounced the blessing.

CONCERT ROOM. TUESDAY EVENING.

COLONIAL CHURCH AND FOREIGN MISSIONS.

THE RIGHT REV. THE LORD BISHOP OF OXFORD IN THE CHAIR.

The Right Rev. the Chairman: The subjects of this evening's discussion—I can hardly call them subjects, for I believe the two to be intimately connected—are Foreign Missions and the Colonial Church. Looking upon them, then, as one, I will say that it is one of the most important questions which can be brought before any gathering of British Churchmen. We have, however, an advantage to-night on which I at once congratulate you, and which is that we have here present amongst us three Bishops, who have come to visit us from the daughter as well as sister Church of America, and no fewer than six Colonial Bishops.¹ Four of the latter have known already the struggles, the difficulties, the supports, and the blessedness of their office; and two have lately been called, as we believe by God, to go forth into that field, and are about to enter upon its labours amidst the prayers and hopes of the Church. At all times the subjects of Missions, and of the Colonial Church as bearing on Missions, should be a matter of the deepest interest to the mother Church at home; for it is the question of her own growth and increase, it is a proof that the tree is of the right stock and has the right life in it. If it grows not it is dead, if it grows not, the living spirit has departed from it: and, therefore, when we have met together to-night to consider the growth of the Church

(1) The Bishops of Barbados, Newfoundland, Adelaide, Antigua, Nelson, and Dunedin.

in this particular way, the difficulties which stand in the way of that growth, and the mode in which those difficulties are to be met, we are dealing with no abstract principles, but with great practical questions, which, if they are to be settled at all, are to be settled just in this manner. May I ask the Bishop of North Carolina to join us here on the orchestra—(the Bishop left the body of the audience, and took his seat amongst his right rev. brethren). There is a special appositeness in our meeting here in a concert-hall, and having the Bishop of North Carolina here in the orchestra—an appositeness which, perhaps, everybody does not know—for before that terrible rupture between our brethren across the Atlantic, in which the very chiefest branches of the Church seemed to be broken asunder by that fearful encounter of human will and passion, and when after that conflict was over, it was a question how the reunion of the Churches could be best accomplished, I venture to say that to no man was it given more abundantly than to our right rev. brother of North Carolina, to be the instrument of healing the rupture and of bringing back the gifts of peace. And we have to-night to be the very perfection of musical instruments. We have a great variety of independent pieces of thought and opinion not all in unison—that would be a horribly dull thing—but all brought together by the welding power of harmony. I do believe that of all practical questions that stir us as a Church and as a nation, there is none of greater importance than that of the Colonial Church. In every respect the Colonial Church is a home placed in new circumstances, developing itself without home restrictions and home support. It is very like the beautiful plant which we buy at the nurseryman's, and then plant it out in the border where it is to stand,—where its roots are no longer cramped by the pot. No doubt there are dangers and difficulty in that first planting out. We must be careful that plants of other kinds do not come too near to rob it of its nourishment. The winds blow upon it from every point of the heavens, and it is exposed to many a strong blast; and yet the object of its planting out is that it may grow into a separate tree, and become another British oak in its new clime and position.

It is for this purpose that the Church of England has been established and strengthened by its Master, and that to this people has been given so much power and greatness on the earth. It is for this reason that in the difficulties which are now besetting the Colonial Church we are so deeply interested at home. Here, at home, strifes are too often kept off, and difficulties smoothed over, by our connexion with the State, and by the highly civilised condition of society. But the evil which works silently here breaks out openly there, and the seats of high Apostolic office have been made the places whence utterances have come which the Churches of Christ from the beginning have condemned as heretical. Thus our daughter Church is experiencing the evil and the strife that are at our own doors at home, and the help or the hindrance that we are to her may be our saving or our ruin. It is under a deep sense of our responsibilities that I meet you to-night, and I ask you to give your whole souls to these important questions—How the Church of Christ is to be planted everywhere in the earth? How, in the purity of its doctrine,

is to be handed on the Apostolic deposit; and how in the completeness of primitive discipline it is to reproduce in other lands the Apostolic Church? We want no other question. We do not want to endeavour to accommodate the Church to the needs of the nineteenth century. Let the nineteenth century in the fulness of its pride, bow itself to the yoke of the Gospel; but let us consider how we may best enshrine her pure doctrine in the protecting garb of Apostolic discipline. For these questions to-night, and the discussion of these important issues, I bespeak your calm and earnest attention. The first paper will be read by Dr. Kay, who laboured long in that branch of our Colonial Church which is located in India.

THE REV. W. KAY, D. D., READ THE FOLLOWING PAPER:—

Two points respecting Mission work are, I think, universally conceded;

First, that our Lord's command, "Go forth and Christianize all nations," applies as stringently to us of the nineteenth century as it did to the disciples in the first century.

Secondly, that the possession of India supplies us with easy access to the noblest of all fields for evangelistic labour.

The practical conclusion would seem to be inevitable. The general duty which attaches to all Christians has been brought home to us in the most definite and forcible way possible. God has committed to us, as He has not committed to any other existing nation, the office of being pioneers and heralds of His kingdom.

It remains to ask—Are we throwing our hearts into this momentous work?

Here again, there is, I think, little difference of opinion among thoughtful men. It is admitted that our efforts are altogether disproportionate to the vastness of the field of labour.

How, indeed, should it be otherwise, when the amount of time and thought expended on the subject is so small?

In general the matter is disposed of by an annual Sermon and an annual meeting; both of them apt to become either dry and formal, or unhealthily exciting. The "Missionary Meeting," in particular, has long been felt by the more earnest class of minds to be one of the most perplexing things they have to deal with. Men of slight convictions, indeed, may glide smoothly over the difficulty;—a few common-places repeated from year to year, a few anecdotes (some of them provoking a smile), followed by sanguine anticipations of success, may satisfy *them*. But there are other minds that cannot be so pacified. They perceive something of the real nature of the work they feel that it deserves the most careful thought, the highest enthusiasm. To hear addresses, which seem to have cost the speaker (as they certainly cost the hearers) no thought, and whose tendency is to "dissipate enthusiasm,"* is to them intense misery. The self-communings of such minds are apt to run in this way:—"Can it be

* Sir J. Stephen, (*Essays*, p. 159) "'Enthusiasm' do not our Pentecosts in the dazzling month dissipate it?"

that the Church is actually responsible for the state of the heathen world? If it be so, why does it not bestir itself? Why does it not deliberate seriously in synod, convocation, and congress, on the proper measures to be adopted for carrying out our Lord's great command? Can He manifest His presence with us, when we are not obeying His most express direction? In whom, then, is the initiative in this matter vested? Old tradition assigns it mainly to the Bishops. Has our insular position, or the legal position of our Bishops as Diocesans, abrogated this responsible privilege? The body of the clergy, again, are restrained parochially; but can their pastoral duties free them from bearing a share of the Church's evangelistic duty?—The laity, too, are they excepted, because 'they cannot preach, except they be sent?' Rather, since the command applies to the Church in solidarity, is not every part and particle of the Church bound to do something towards its fulfilment? What, then, am *I* doing,—I, whose reason, and conscience, and (I trust) jealousy for God's honour, and desire to obey my Lord, and compassion for perishing souls, urge me to action?—Yet, alas! what can I do? How is it possible to ignore the wants of the Church at home,—the battle that is here going on with schism, misbelief, infidelity,—with the vices of large towns, and the ignorance of country districts? Can I be justified in leaving these? Yet if I remain here, I feel as if I were scarcely at all in organic connexion with the Missionary Church."

The result is that such men, in sheer perplexity, sometimes abstain altogether from taking any part in Missionary proceedings:—too honest to yield to the conventional fiction of giving "their mite," (a wholly different thing, *that*, from the "widow's mite" of the Gospel) and having, perhaps, already given with full heart their "costly alabaster-box of spikenard" to some Church purpose nearer home.

Yet it is certain that the responsibility which belongs to every English Churchman cannot be got rid of. The Church of England cannot, if she would, "abdicate her obligation";¹—an obligation, which is inherent in the very fact of our present connexion with India.

Can nothing, then, be done to remedy, or mitigate, this perplexity?

I think much may be done, and that in a way that presents no serious difficulty. I suggested the plan last year at Norwich. I would humbly submit it in greater detail to this Congress, and through it to the Rulers of the Church.

It is this;—that some season be set apart for more special attention to this great duty; and what season so obviously fitted for it as that which intervenes between Ascension-Day and Whit-Sunday?—Ascension-Day, which reminds us of the words,—“All power is given to me in Heaven and Earth: therefore, go forth and Christianize all nations;” and Whit-Sunday, when in our Eucharistic Collect we thank God for having brought us “out of heathen darkness into His

(1) The expression is borrowed from an article in *Fraser's Magazine*, (1864,) which is dealing only with the secular side of our duty to India. "England has [in India] a vast field of positive duty and prospective usefulness,—a field to task the grandest energies,—a field to satisfy the noblest ambition. We hold there the double position of lords paramount and of a race of loftier and more advanced civilization. We incur, then, the double and most solemn responsibilities of political supremacy and of intellectual pre-eminence: we cannot abdicate our obligation." The argument is correct so far as it goes; and, plainly, should go much further.

clear light;"—while the whole period would speak to us of "waiting" for Divine direction,—“till we were endued with power from on high.”

In this solemn period all would (with God's blessing) tend to real and deep feeling;—such as springs from rational conviction, aided by devout meditation;—such as would lead to no fitful, spasmodic, efforts, but to calm and sustained action.

The Services of the ten days would naturally embrace both Prayers and Sermons.

The special purpose of the latter would be to train the mind of the Church to take nobler views of its duty. They would relate, therefore, to the Nature, History, and Prospects of God's kingdom in the world. They might profitably include the following subjects, (admitting of great variety of treatment:)

1. The Old Testament Prophecies of Christ's Kingdom.
2. The character of that Kingdom as traced out in the Gospels.
3. Our Lord's commission to His disciples.
4. The growth of the Apostolic Church as set forth in the "Acts."
5. St. Paul's missionary labours.
6. The state of the heathen both before and after Christ.
7. The progress of Christianity in the first six centuries.
8. Mediæval missions.
9. Modern missions.
10. The missionary opportunities of the English Church.

Such a series of discourses would provide a sound basis for Missionary exertion. There would be no thought here of party or personal feeling. The one motive appealed to would be loyalty to Christ our Lord; the one aim to bring all men to that knowledge of God which is Eternal Life; the one ground of confidence—Christ's presence with His Church.

Under such a course of teaching how readily should we shake off those anxieties about immediate results, which do so much to weaken men's energies. We should sow the seed of God's word, as little doubting its efficacy as the farmer doubts the prolific vitality of the grain he puts in the ground. We should work on, as he does, with patient faith in God's goodness: not going suspiciously, from time to time, to uncover the seed, and see if it be beginning to strike out gemmule or radicle; but trusting Him, who has bid us to sow in hope, and who, for so many ages, has never failed to bless the honest labour of His servants. Valuable, however, as this homiletic instruction would be, it is not the most important part what is now proposed. The primary object would be to secure the Church's *Prayers*.

The need of this is, in theory, acknowledged on all sides. Why then is the Church to be precluded from supplying so manifest a want? God has called us by His Providence to stand in a wonderful relation to the whole heathen world, and to India in particular. Is an uneccelesiastical notion of finality in the Form of Common Prayer, to prevent the living Church from finding its way, as a Church, to the throne of grace, there to ask for strength and wisdom suited to its present circumstances? The Church Catholic is appointed to intercede for all the nations of the world. The English branch has been specially called to stand as intercessor for India. For 35 centuries that

land has been possessed with the impure spirits of superstition and idolatry. "This kind goeth not forth but by prayer and fasting."

Materials for drawing up an "Order of Prayers for Missions" are ready at hand, in books which have been long in use both in India and in England. What is needed is that we should have an authorised form added to the Prayer-Book in an Appendix, (as suggested by the Bishop of Oxford seven years ago.)¹

It may be said: "Such a course is full of danger. Who knows, if once we begin to add, where we shall stop?"

The reply is simple: "If it can be shown that there is any other duty neglected by the Church of the same importance with the one we are now speaking of, let *that* also be attended to. In any case, God will not allow us to suffer harm from the adoption of so manifestly a right measure."

Does any one say:—"How are we to find sufficient variety in the subjects of Intercession to occupy ten days?"

I answer; "The real difficulty is:—How shall we be able to include in our supplication all the urgent wants that press on our notice?"

Without going beyond the limits of our Indian Empire:—

I. Think, first of all, of the millions of Hindus, Buddhists, and Mohammedans, whom the voice of the Christian Missionary has not yet reached. Yet the influence of our presence among them has everywhere unsettled men's minds:—waking up in some indefinite hopes of approaching good; in others stirring up superstitious dread of coming evil; rousing in many a bitter re-actionary spirit, that leads them to try to galvanise their moribund Paganism to new activity. There,—in that chaos of shapeless thought and sentiment,—are the elements out of which may come forth some monstrous form of impiety or fanaticism to desolate the next age, or from which may arise a new embodiment of Gospel principles, such as shall put to shame the old Churches of Europe, and inaugurate the last (and, we trust, most glorious) cycle of Church history.—Which of the two it shall be, *may* depend on the earnestness of our prayers.

II. Then, secondly, we should think of that large and growing class, who have come so far within the range of Christian influence as to have given up all belief in their traditional systems, but have not gone on to embrace the Gospel. Of these not a few have advanced, in their movement in quest of light, up to the point which English Unitarians have reached in receding from the light. They speak as ardently as Channing, Parker, or the author of "*Ecce Homo*," of the beauty of Christ's human character and the purity of Christian Ethics. They write earnestly against the sins of worldliness and sensuality;—even admire the "Cross of Christ" as a symbol of self-mortification; and reprove the English for their "Mammon worship."

Do not these men—prejudiced against Christianity by the infidelity and immorality of professed Christians—most justly demand our sympathy and our *Prayers*?

III. Others, again, stand in marked contrast with these. They have been thoroughly impressed with the truth of Christianity; but cannot resolve to confess their faith at the cost of severing themselves from kindred, friends, and property. All their old associations of

(1) In a Speech in Convocation, February, 1859.

thought, their respect for authority, their superstitious dread of a mother's curse, their intense love of their race and country, plead in favour of *procrastination*.

Shall not the Church be to these, what Monnica was to her procrastinating son? Shall we not follow them with our intercession, praying that they may be enabled to break through the fetters that hold them to the world, and give themselves resolutely to Christ?

IV. The native Christians, also, call for our help. Few in number, cut adrift from their old connections, yet seldom, alas! finding among us English the cordiality which might in some degree compensate to them for the sacrifices they have made:—beset with old memories of Pagan licentiousness:—living in a land where Idolatry is still regnant:—perhaps, brought into contact with European unbelief:—is it to be wondered at, if after awhile some fall away from their “first love”? Ought not the Home Church to pray fervently that “their faith fail not”?

V. And is there not another class requiring all the aid we can give them,—the Missionaries themselves? They have gone forth, not as independent adventurers to win conquests for themselves, but to fight the Church's battles:—shall not we at home do for them what Moses did for Joshua,—hold up our hands in supplication for them, till their victory is complete?

Never from the beginning have evangelists had more serious hindrances to overcome. Nowhere has Christianity been confronted with so massive a social barrier as that of Hindu Caste:—nowhere with so ancient and strongly compacted a body of religious tradition as is supplied by the Hindu sacred Books;—nowhere with such bold avowals of pantheism;—nowhere with so frightful instances of the perversion of the religious instinct itself to purposes of direct immorality.

How shall they—a handful of men—overthrow these mighty fortresses of “spiritual wickedness,” if we do not help them by our hearty intercessions:—if we do not pray that they may be upheld in loving, faithful, patient discharge of their arduous duties; ever intent on their great work of “turning men from darkness to light”; and perpetually cheered with the abundant consolations of the HOLY GHOST?

VI. Nor, lastly, must we forget the general body of Europeans in India and the members of the Civil and Military Services in particular. If these all led the godly, pure, charitable lives, which many of them do, how would the power of the Missionary's word be multiplied a thousand-fold! how would truth spread with electric speed!

So much as regards our intercessions for India.

There is one more prayer that must of necessity be added. It is one of the very few prayers prescribed to us by our Lord Himself. The words are familiar to us.

“*The harvest truly is plenteous, but the labourers are few. Pray ye, therefore, the Lord of the harvest, that He will send forth labourers into His harvest.*” (Matt. ix. 37. Luke x. 2.)

ἐκβάλλη ἐργάτας;—that He will lay His hands upon them, take them

away from the posts they now occupy, and bid them go and reap His harvest.

In this our English Church there are now (thank God!) on all sides many zealous and able labourers for God. But they are conscious of no distinct call to propagate the gospel in heathen lands. The All-wise God, however, has an endless variety of means, by which He can, if He see good, detach men from their home work, and give them both the inward preparation and the outward call for the foreign work. Pray we, then, that He will put forth His power at this momentous period of our national history:—this, which more emphatically than any former period, may be styled “the day of our visitation.”

Would it not be a joyful thing, a matter of happy augury, not for us only but for the whole world, if Englishmen, found now in every region of the globe, were to join in offering up supplications for the world’s conversion? if the globe were thus to have a chain of intercessory prayer thrown around it? Might we not hope that a fresh outpouring of Pentecostal grace (kept in reserve till it was drawn forth by prayer) was not far distant?

Let none object to such anticipations as “enthusiastic.” Rather let us blush to think that while secular skill and policy seem as if they had erased “impossible” from their vocabulary:—having faith in the inexhaustible fertility of nature, and finding that this fertility reveals itself to the patient and humble inquirer;—*we* do not exercise the same faith in Him, who, by His volition, gave being to nature.

“If only thou wilt believe:—all things are possible to him who believeth.”

All! Yes; even this, that India, which has been so many centuries laden with sin and misery, may rise and take her place (what if it should be the foremost place?) in the Church of Christ.

And then,—with a Christianized India operating upon Asia and Africa,—should we not at length see those sayings verified? “A short work will the Lord make upon the earth.” “A nation shall be born in a day.”

THE REV. E. GARBETT READ THE FOLLOWING PAPER:—

THE terms of my subject have led me to think that our popular use of the word Mission is inaccurate, and that it is necessary to define it more closely. For we commonly apply the word to every exertion of Christian activity, without any distinction of the class of persons towards whom it is exercised. Thus we speak of Home Missions as well as Foreign Missions, and we apply the same term without limitation to separate branches of Home Mission work. In the same way my subject classes together Colonial and Foreign Missions as if they stood upon the same footing, and were to be guided by the same principles. Thus employed, the word is simply an expression for the expansive and aggressive strength of the Church of Christ, the necessary out-going of her own spiritual life in the life of other men; the discharge of her great primal commission given by the lips of her master—“Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded

you; and lo! I am with you always, even unto the end of the World."

But vitally important as this expansive and aggressive principle is, we must make a further distinction according to the direction in which it is exercised. By Missions in its precise sense we mean the effort of the Church to make her message of divine love known to lands where no Church exists; in other words, to win new territories to the empire of Christ, not to cultivate more perfectly territories already won. The word thus represents distinctively the labour of the Church for the conversion of the heathen. A hasty glance at what I believe to be the typical instance of all Missionary Work, will enable me to draw the distinction with greater clearness. This instance is supplied in the first Missionary Journey of Paul and Barnabas, revealed in Acts xiii. Up to this time no Mission Work, in the proper sense of the word, had been undertaken by the Apostles. We are told, indeed, that the members of the Church, at Jerusalem, scattered by the persecution after the death of St. Stephen, "went every where preaching the word." But in whatever sense the expression may be understood, it denotes an unconscious not a conscious and intentional fulfilment of the Divine purpose. During the period of rest elapsing after the conversion of St. Paul, the Apostles made itinerating journeys in various quarters. But these appear to have been directed towards the consolidation of existing Churches, not the introduction of the Gospel into regions where it was unknown. The connection of the narrative implies this—"Then had the Churches rest throughout all Judæa, and Galilee, and Samaria, and were edified, and walking in the fear of the Lord, and in the comfort of the Holy Ghost were multiplied; and it came to pass as Peter passed through all quarters." The calling of the Gentiles in the case of Cornelius was an isolated transaction of which the full meaning was not apparently understood at the time even by the principal agent, and was not part of a recognised and methodical system. Thus up to the period of Acts xiii no effort was made indicative of a consciousness that the whole world was formally to be taken possession of in the name of the Lord Jesus. The Church at Antioch was apparently fully occupied in doing her own work and truly the spiritual wants of that witty and profligate city were great enough to tax all the strength of a much larger body of clergy than are enumerated by St. Luke. As much later as the fourth century the Christian community at Antioch constituted only one-fourth of the entire population and at the time of the Apostles it must have been very much less than this. The Apostles had enough to do where they were, and apparently had no intention of extending their labours any further. It was the express command of God the Holy Ghost that sent them forth, leaving part of their body to minister at Antioch and separating part to preach to the heathen. "Separate me Barnabas and Paul for the work whereunto I have called them." The immediate authority of God himself established the principle that the necessities of the work at home were not to prevent the doing the work abroad. The Home work and the Mission work were ever to be maintained concurrently. The union of the two implies, at the same time, the distinction between them. The Home work is the work among those who are professedly Christians, and in the midst of whom an organized Christian Church exists; the

Mission work is distinctively the gathering of new Churches, the preaching of Him who is the Church's living and glorious Head, unto the heathen.

The maintenance of this distinction enables me to lay part of my subject on one side with little comparative notice. For Colonial Churches are the children of the mother Churches, as the Colonies are children of the mother Country. They have, therefore, the child's right to the inheritance of all the parent's privileges. The Church is latent in her rights, even where she is not manifest in her ministry and order, her sacraments, and her discipline. I do not forget that the sins of the past have given a Missionary character even to the Colonial Church, and in that proportion the work must be conducted on Missionary principles. But this is the unhappy accident of our position, not its normal and legitimate character. The Colonial work is part of the Home work of the Church, and it should be our object to re-produce in the Colonies the whole completed church system, as we are privileged to possess it among ourselves. On this subject no diversity of opinion is likely to exist.

It is the mission work specifically and the rules by which the Church should be guided in respect to it that we need to consider. Where are we to look for the true Church principle, where find the model after which our missionary efforts are to be framed? For myself I have no hesitation in answering that our model is to be drawn from the highest and truest of all antiquity—the antiquity of the Apostolic times and our rules from Apostolic precept and example, as contained in the inspired narrative, and, therefore, authenticated by the inspired authority of the Sacred Scriptures.

I adopt this as the rule, among other reasons, because I am unable to find a clear model anywhere else. No invariable and consistent mode of action is suggested of the practice of the Church. In accordance with the distinction already laid down we must look for guidance not to the dealings of the Church with the nations within her pale, but with the nations beyond it. Not how did she consolidate and extend her sanctifying influence over the masses of mankind, nominally within her reach, but by what means did she extend the knowledge of the truth to the heathen tribes beyond, is the question we need to solve. We must answer it not by setting up an ideal of our own, but by carefully examining such scanty facts as remain to us. Such an ideal it is very easy and, perhaps, very natural to form. We conceive the Church filled with the presence of her Divine Head, and clothed with her great prerogatives, as stedfastly setting herself to the conquest of the world. Through her proper authority she calls her agents, prepares them for the work, clothes them with her authority and credentials, organises them after her order, selects their sphere, and then sends them forth to carry the banner of the Crucified, triumphant over the world. They go forth not a mere group of individuals, but a complete microcosm of the Church herself, representing in every land her comeliness and beauty. Full herself of the Spirit of God, and, therefore, full of spiritual life and strong in the promised presence of her Master, she seems to our fancy to fulfil the prophetic picture:—"The Lord gave the word, great was the company of those that published it; kings of armies did flee apace." Such

is, I think, the ideal we naturally form as God's divinely appointed scheme of Missionary labour. The picture is a fair one and I cannot wonder that it fascinates many minds. But experience like the touch of Ithuriel's spear dissipates it to the winds. We turn to the actual facts so far as they are known to us, and partial and imperfect as our information is, it suffices to show that from the time of the Apostles till now there has been nothing in the history of the Church even remotely correspondent with it.

We find the Church stretching herself on all sides, but by a great variety of methods. It may be my own fault, but I am not able to recall since the Apostolic days any instance where regular Church action, that is synodical action, has been the origin of missions. They have in many cases originated in the zeal of individual bishops touched with the love of Christ, and with a God-like pity for heathen blindness and superstition. Thus the great Chrysostom and the greater Athanasius were the active promoters of missions. The Gauls were indebted to the zeal of Polycarp for the possession of the Word of Life. Gregory was sent to Cæsarea by Thædimus, Pantænus to India by Demetrius, Frumentius to Abyssinia by Athanasius, and Augustine to our own country by Gregory. Thus in later times Poland owed the Gospel to Bishop Otto, and Prussia to Archbishop Adalbert. We meet with such cases in abundance, but side by side with them we find cases of a very different character. The most remarkable Missionary enterprises of the world have sprung out of private and individual zeal. They have been schemed in the brain and supported by the sacrifices of men, who in some cases were not even in orders, but who took orders for the sake of the work. Such for instance were St. Patrick in Ireland, St. Columba in Scotland: such were Valentinus and Severinus, the Apostles of Austria, Columbanus in Burgundy, and Boniface in Germany. Such men drew their motives from a personal experience of the love of God. "I was sixteen years old," says St. Patrick, "and I knew not the true God, but in a strange land the Lord brought me to a sense of my unbelief, so that although late I minded one of my sins and turned with my whole heart to the Lord my God." They believed themselves to derive their Missionary call direct from the Holy Spirit. The remonstrances and entreaties of kindred and friends could not prevent them from obeying this call. "It was not in my own power," says Patrick, "but it was God who conquered in me and withstood them all." Sometimes such men settled themselves alone or with a few companions amid barbarous tribes, and by the moral force of example and love conquered them to the Cross. Sometimes Providential circumstances made them Missionaries without their will, as with the Christian prisoners among the Gothic nations. Sometimes a divinely ordered course of events determined their calling. It was the fact that Patrick was twice a prisoner in Ireland that awoke his unconquerable resolution to evangelise that land. Ædesius and Frumentius were captives in Abyssinia and laymen when they first preached the Gospel there. In other cases missions have originated in the humanity of kings, as when Justinian sent a mission to the Abasgians, Constantine to the Arabians, and Louis Debonair into Sweden. In not a few instances Christianity has been propagated by the authority of the magistrate and the weapons

of the soldier. I quote in instance, the edicts of the emperors against Paganism, the enforcement of Christianity at the edge of the sword, on the Franks by Clovis, on the Saxons by Charlemagne, on the Norwegians by Hacon and Olaf, and on the Russians by Vladimir. In other cases women have been the principal agents of opening kingdoms to the Gospel, as with the Franks and the Saxons and in Bulgaria, Pomerania, and Russia. There are further cases where the effective instrument was less the living preacher than the living word. Thus Chrysostom trained Missionaries in the Scriptures of their own native vernacular. Ulphilas gave the Goths the Bible in their own language as early as the fourth century, and the rude soil proved so congenial that Jerome expressed his astonishment at their skill in biblical criticism. While in Moravia, the first effort of Methodius and Constantine was to give the people the Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles in their own Slavonic dialect, thus exactly anticipating the method pursued in many modern missions.

Amid all these varied facts it is evident that the Church of Christ has never adopted any uniform model for Missionary work, and that consequently no one mode can be called a distinctively Church mode more than another. We are at liberty to choose out of the various instrumentalities whichever most commends itself to our theological predilections; but with these facts before us we are not at liberty to assert that selected mode to be the mode of the Church. The ideal of universal and formal Church action, repeating herself everywhere, and by the grandeur of a visible organised society subduing the nations to the foot of the Cross appears no where in the facts. In its place we are presented with the picture of a great principle of life expanding itself on every side, and in that expansion availing itself of every instrument that offered, and adapting itself to every opportunity. The Waters of Life gushed forth spontaneously out of the very fullness of hearts touched by the Holy Ghost; and as natural waters would do, adapting themselves to circumstances as they rose, carried the word of life through the world, just as God made the opening, prepared the agents, and gave the blessing.

It is most true that the great Missionaries of the early ages ever sought to ally themselves with the authority and discipline of the Church: and as their work was done, they united the Churches, they gathered to the unity of the Catholic faith. Sometimes they received simple orders. Thus Severinus in Bavaria, Gallus in Switzerland, Ulphilas in Germany, were priests, not bishops, and continued so to the last. Even Augustine was sent by Gregory as a Monk, not a Bishop, and was consecrated subsequently. Sometimes episcopal rank was refused by them. Sometimes they were ordained Missionary Bishops, *episcopi regionarii*. At other times they were made Bishops and Archbishops. But in the vast majority of instances the work was done first, and the rank followed afterwards; not the rank first, and the work afterwards. The interval elapsing, moreover, between the beginning of the Mission, and its being brought into order of the appointment of a Bishopric, was greater than we think; for time, like space, is as much foreshortened to the eye in the past as it is in the future. That this is the true order is proved by a rule of the ancient

African Church, that he who had gathered in a Church into the Catholic unity, and kept it undisturbed for three years, should himself be consecrated to be its Bishop.

It thus appears, that in a majority of instances, mission work did not originate with the Church as a Church. It originated in individual zeal and subsequently received Church authorisation. I cannot too much admire the pliant adaptability with which the Church of those early days ever took up into herself these noble outbursts of Christian enthusiasm and made them regular by accepting their very irregularity. She absorbed them into her own life and thus placed the glory of them as a diadem upon her own brow. Would that our own Church had the same dexterous pliancy, the same skill in allying herself with every form of Christian activity. I, for one, painfully feel that our inability to adapt ourselves to time and circumstances, has something of old age about it and is the mark of a body whose fingers have grown stiff with years, and her heart somewhat chilled with caution.

It appears from the facts enumerated, that the practice of the Church supplies no consistent model for the conduct of Christian missions. It must further be added, that in different periods the practice of the Church has been inconsistent alike with its own earlier principles and with the clear teaching of the Scriptures. It is certain that the Missionary efforts of the later and middle ages have not been conducted in the same way as the Missionary efforts of the earlier and more primitive period. This acknowledgment is candidly made in the able lectures of Archdeacon Grant, before the University of Oxford. I quote him because he will be accepted, at least, from my point of view, as an impartial witness. He divides the ages, before the Reformation, into two periods. The one includes the four first centuries after Christ, the other the succeeding centuries till the Reformation date. He draws with some little air of reluctance, as of an honest mind, yielding to the force of facts, the following contrasts between them. The earlier period appealed to the intellect, the reason, and the conscience; the later appealed to civilisation, that is externally to the use of ceremonial, symbols and imposing spectacles, and internally to the instruction and training of civilised life. Secondly, in the former the Gospel offered no compromise, but renounced all heathen principles and practices; in the latter there was allowed a certain accommodation to ignorance and adoption of heathen practices, to win over prejudice. In the former, conversions were individual; in the latter, they were national. In the former, the course of Christianity was from the lower up to the higher; in the latter princes were addressed first and then the people. In the former conversions were genuine and real, there was more earnest faith and suffering devotion; in the latter, there was a greater local extension of the Christianity that was taught.

I fancy that few will hesitate, in our day, to regard the latter period, so far as this contrast is concerned as a declension from the lofty and pure Scriptural principles which actuated the Church during the primitive ages. Nor will it be denied that the looser and more worldly principles adopted in the later period formed their full development in the Jesuit missions of the period since the Reformation. The

fraud and falsehood characteristic of these missions must be painful to every honest mind. They were founded on little more than a system of bribery to the outward profession of a faith which was not even understood. Men were considered fit to receive baptism on repeating by rote a few phrases, from which the mind caught no meaning. It is no wonder that where discipleship was so easy and profession brought so much, conversions could be counted by thousands and tens of thousands. The work was but a splendid name. There was no strength because there was no reality in it. It was built up like a house of sand upon the shore, and like the house of sand melted away beneath the first wave. No language can be more strongly condemnatory of the work, more expressive of the indignant shame it deserves to call up to the cheek, than that of the Roman Catholic historians. These missions were but a parody on religion, and a monstrous caricature of the great commission given to the Church of Christ for her risen Master.

But that these Jesuit Missions did carry out to the full principles appear not only from the manifest connexion of a corrupt practice with long at work within the Church before the Reformation date will a corrupt doctrine, but likewise from independent evidence. The same sweeping conversions of masses at once are found very long before the time of Frances Xavier. The Monk Augustine in our own land is recorded to have baptised 10,000 persons at one time. Boniface counted his converts at 100,000. That the tendency to look to numbers of converts rather than to the sincerity of converts was early perceived by the best minds of the Church, as a danger to be guarded against, is proved by this fact—that when Charlemagne resolved to evangelise the Huns, the Abbot Aleuin drew up a code of rules for the guidance of the mission. Prominent among these rules was the necessity of watching that conviction of the truths of the faith went before baptism, “since the washing of the body without any knowledge of the faith could be of no use.” The advice was given because of the ill success caused by the neglect of this rule among the Saxons. Now the caution palpably implies a state of feeling that needed it.

I believe that the corrupt practice adopted in missions during the later period of the Church arose from corrupt doctrine, and that both entered on their course of development in the days of Constantine. It would be wonderful if the fact had not been so, if we remember that the popular notion that all the world suddenly became Christian is absurdly exaggerated. There is probable truth in Gibbons's facts although not in his conclusion for them, when he estimates the number of Christians to have been only one in twenty of the whole population of the empire. The fact is made probable by the fact that at every age of the world, the great mass of mankind have ever rejected a true and vital religion. So long as the Church was an esoteric society in the midst of this mass of heathenism, the preservation of her purity was possible; but directly the mass of heathenism became included with the visible society, the effect was inevitable. In proportion as false doctrines began to gain influence in that proportion the false practice corresponding to it followed.

Hence we see that it is impossible to adopt the practice of the Church consecutively viewed, and then generalised, as a guide for

missions; because it is not only diverse and inconsistent, but because it would logically lead to principles equally condemned by the first truths of Scripture, and the undeniable facts of experience. Hence we must fall back on the Apostolic model as the only possible model for imitation, and on the principles of Scripture as our only practicable rules. In doing this we only adopt the conclusion to which the inspired authority of the Word of God must itself lead every devout mind.

If we once accept this conclusion, the question is to a great degree settled. Our differences of opinion on the proper management of Missions will be just as great, and no greater than our differences of opinion on the teaching of Scripture. I occupy the brief space alone remaining by concisely stating the general principles which it appears to me we must gather from it, as frankly stating my own opinions, as I am prepared frankly to respect the opinions of others.

I. The instrumentality to be employed is the preaching of the Gospel of Christ by living agents, resting the authority of their ministry upon the word of God. Questions as to the adjustment of the relative position of the living ministry and the authoritative word do not directly come into discussion. All are agreed that in the practical work of Missions the living ministry must be first in the order of time.

II. The object of this ministry is first individual and then collective, or multitudinous. It is collective because it is individual. No corporate body has any entity, either brains or heart, apart from the individuals constituting it. The Church is to follow with its visible order and ordinances as the work is done, but the doing of the work begins with the individuals. Personal conviction of truth in single man and women is the ground work of all the rest. This conviction includes the truths by virtue of which men are Christians, as well as those by virtue of which men are Churchmen. But the Christianity must necessarily precede the Churchmanship.

III. The sole agent by whom personal conviction can be accomplished is God the Holy Ghost; and the instrument through which he ordinarily operates is the preached word. Men "are born again" by the "incorruptible seed which liveth and abideth for ever." "And this is the word which by the Gospel is preached unto you."

IV. The preaching of this instrumental word should be entrusted, so far as the most jealous supervision on the part of the Church can secure such a result, to men who are themselves taught of the Holy Ghost and whose motive of action is drawn from a personal experience of the love of God.

V. As the work is done, that is as the mission ends, and out of the mission emerges the Church, that Church should be settled in her completeness of Apostolic order as well as of Apostolical doctrine,—the full body of Christ with all the members in particular ordained by her Great Master.

VI. Wherever missions are thus undertaken and conducted Christ Himself will be with them, and according to His own promise will bless them with success. But this success will be limited not absolute. Unbelief, indifference, and sin will remain within the Church; opposition and enmity and strife will ever beset the Church

without, till the final coming and glorious kingdom of our Master. In the words of Archdeacon Grant "whatever may be the final destiny of the Church, no glowing scene of peace and purity before the end of all things is promised; but frequent forebodings of departure form the faith, corruptions and wrestlings with the world and Satan, and persecutions. These deepening as the solemn drama of God's counsels draws to a close."

As the grand principle of all the mission work should begin, be carried on, and end in Christ. We must lift up the Cross and adopt in faith the motto which Constantine probably adopted in superstition.

ἐν τούτῳ νίκα

THE REV. CANON TREVOR READ THE FOLLOWING PAPER RECEIVED FROM THE
LORD BISHOP OF CALCUTTA.

THE opportunity has been offered me of endeavouring to interest the Congress in some of the wants of my Diocese, and I gladly accept the proposal for this reason among others;—whether the attacks sometimes made on Colonial Bishops for frequent visits to England are just or unjust, there is no doubt that Indian Bishops are free from reproach on this score; not however from any virtue of their own, but from the stern provisions of divers Acts of Parliament, which lay down even such minute particulars as their furlough rules. By the stringent law that the Metropolitan cannot under any circumstances return to England till after a residence of ten years in India, nor a suffragan Bishop till after a residence of fifteen years, my brethren and myself are no doubt effectually preserved from all temptation to visit Great Exhibitions, whether in London or Paris, or, as I have seen it more coarsely put, to dine with the Lord Mayor. But if this rigorous repression of all home-sickness is in some ways advantageous, and at all events saves us from a certain amount of gossip and inuendo, it also debars us from legitimate opportunities of making known to our friends at home the condition of the Churches entrusted to our oversight.

And hence perhaps it has happened that the notions generally entertained in England of the religious wants of India are vague and imperfect. It is common to read comments in ecclesiastical journals on the monstrous size of the Indian dioceses, especially that of Calcutta, nor do we for a moment dispute the justice of such remarks. Again, great interest is often expressed in the conversion of the Hindus, and wonder and regret that it proceeds so slowly. Attention too has recently been called to the remarkable effects of English education on the youth of Bengal, and to the existence of a class or sect tracing its origin to the semi-Christianized Brahmin, Ram Mohun Roy, and at present accepting Theodore Parker and Francis Newman as religious guides. I doubt not that if I were to lay before the Congress some observations on any one of these subjects, I should excite more attention than I can hope to do by the far less interesting topic with which I am about to trouble them. But it is because the wants of which I desire to write are of a character which do not lay such powerful hold on the imagination, and are not so generally known and appreciated as the multiplication of bishoprics, the conversion of a

nation to Christ, and the effects of science and literature in effacing ancient superstitions, that I have selected them for the foundation of a message and plea for help to my fellow-churchmen at home.

I sometimes doubt whether people in England believe that there are in India any European laymen at all except the army, the Governor-General, and a few "competition wallahs." Thus a liberal friend of mine, whom I asked to help me in some educational schemes, intended, as I endeavoured to explain, solely for Christian children, declined to contribute on the plea that schools which must include so many different races, religions, and classes, ought not to be entirely in the hands of the Church. A disputant of opposite sentiments also refused to aid, from reading in the *Record* that the Bible is not taught in Indian schools, thinking of course that there are no schools but Government schools and no scholars but natives. A writer in the *Guardian*, noticing a circular of mine in which the shareholders of an Indian railway were urged to remember the duty of providing for the spiritual wants of the Europeans in their employ, made merry with this "novel method of promoting missionary operations." A female correspondent, from the frequent repetition of the question, *how many converts have you made?* evidently thinks that the sole occupation of the Indian clergy is to preach to the heathen. It is indeed impossible to over-estimate the greatness and dignity of that work, but it is far from being the only, scarcely even the most pressing, work which has at this moment to be done amongst us.

The truth is that India is becoming more and more like an English colony, and now contains a very considerable population, wholly or partially of European origin, professing the Christian faith, but in too many cases bringing dishonour on the Christian name. Some who know India will object to my use of the term *colony*. Doubtless it never can be a colony in the sense in which Australia and Canada are colonies. The English population of this country will not include representatives of all classes of English society, for labourers from England cannot carry on their work in the plains, and are not wanted for work in the hills. But it is approaching to the condition of a colony in a modified sense: it is colonized, not by labourers, but by employers and overseers of labour. English and semi-English families are scattered in almost every part of it. First there is the East Indian Railway starting its huge length of iron for above 1000 miles from Calcutta to Delhi, and forming part of a great system, of which another line of about 250 miles from Amritsir to Moultan is already complete, while several branches are in rapid progress. The foundation of a second network of other railways on the other side of the Ganges is laid in the line from Calcutta to Koohstea, 110 miles in length. Now along these roads with their loops, feeders, and branches, and in the districts in which railway works are still in progress, European drivers, firemen, mechanics, guards, and overseers, with their families, are to be found sometimes in considerable communities; sometimes in smaller groups, sometimes in isolated houses.

Then there are the agricultural operations. The long valley of Assam watered by the Brahmaputra, the fertile plain of Cachar shaded by the Kossyah and Jynteah hills, the beautiful Himalayan districts of Kangra and Kumaon, are filled with tea-planters. Although

the cultivation of indigo has received a blow from the recent interruption of an indefensible system, yet it still employs many Englishmen in Tirhoot and Lower Bengal, who require the help and advice of a pastor even more than their predecessors. For it is not now so common for the manufacturers of indigo to reside with their wives and families at their factories, as to depute agents, generally young unmarried men, to superintend the work. To these must be added the captains and officers of coasting and river steamers, the collectors of the Government salt duties scattered along an extended cordon of custom-houses, from the heart of the Punjab far down into Central India, tradesmen, road-surveyors, contractors, all with souls to be cared for, children to be educated, sorrows to be comforted, evil inclinations to be checked, open sins to be rebuked, spiritual needs to be satisfied.

Then there is the numerically important race which has sprung from the mixture of European and native blood. The East Indians, or *Eurasians* as they like to be called,—a name which ought I suppose to have been at least *Europasians*, but whether formed on correct principles of etymology or not, it is much to be preferred to the title of *half-castes*, which is sometimes contemptuously applied to them, though greatly to be deprecated as encouraging the notion which we Christians are bound to counteract, that Englishmen and Hindus are not only different nations, but different *castes* or orders of human beings, separated from each other by God's eternal laws and incapable even of eating together, each fancying the other a race of inferior clay composition, the Englishman speaking of the Hindu as a "nigger," the Hindu of the Englishman as *Mlecha* or impure. These Eurasians are sometimes said to unite all the vices both of the natives and the English,—an unkind and untrue criticism; which even if it were correct, would convey a severe censure on us English Christians for neglecting to provide them with those means of improvement, by which the evil tendencies of any race or class, whatever be their origin, can alone be held in check. The principal clerks at our seat of government and other large towns belong to this race, which however has also its representatives in many other occupations.

Again, below all who are provided with definite employment, there are to be found people commonly called *loafers*, wandering not only in our chief cities but along the highroads of India, discharged soldiers or seamen perhaps, or Australians who have come here to sell horses, but have either found a bad market or spent all their money, or men who have been turned out of some regular employment for drunkenness or other immorality, all bringing the Christian name into ever increasing degradation. On this subject I may be allowed to quote a few sentences from the *Friend of India*, a paper which has been conspicuous from its commencement for its serious and philanthropic tone:—

"The back slums of Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay, the hospitals and dispensaries which Government supports, the weary tramps who are to be found on the roads or in the ditches of rural India, under the deadly sun of May or drenched in the rains of July, the ever-recurring criminal sessions of the High Courts, the jails and houses of correction, the pauper funerals and uncared for graves, all bear testimony in open day to a state of things, disgraceful enough at home,

but intolerable here. The railways, the army, and the mercantile marine are ever contributing new victims to the moral lukewarmness which is at first so delightful to the uneducated Englishman in India. The vicious classes of Southern Europe moreover are only too eager to supply the markets of the East; and Christian prostitution is regularly fed, by way of Egypt, with the offscourings of the Levant and the Adriatic."

It will not then, I think, be denied that, quite apart from all directly evangelistic work among the heathen, there is here a sufficiently vast field for the Church's operations; within the pale of nominal Christianity, there are many amongst us baptized into the Redeemer's name who must be preserved to the faith, or reclaimed from wickedness and despair. Let me now state briefly what agencies we have at work for these purposes and what help we require.

It will be observed that in the above enumeration of Europeans in India, I have said nothing of the most important section of the Christian community, the European army by which the country is garrisoned, and the great number of officials, covenanted civilians, members of the staff corps, and uncovenanted servants in the employ of Government, who carry on the civil administration. Their wants are supposed to be provided for by the Chaplains. These are not under military control, though the majority of them are pastors of military congregations; but they form a distinct service, being selected in England by the Secretary of State for India with the concurrence of the Bishop of London, and appointed to their several stations or parishes by the Bishop of the diocese to which they are assigned, whose nominations, however, must be confirmed by the local Government. There are 90 chaplains at my disposal, but of these 19 (a number above the average owing to temporary causes) are now absent from India. Perhaps I may generally reckon on having 75 available for service, or 73 excluding the Archdeacon and my own domestic chaplain, neither of whom can take parochial work. As with these 75 chaplains I have to supply all the large civil and military stations, from Singapore in the S.E. to Peshawur in the N.W., and from the extremity of Assam in the N.E. to Mhow in the S.W., it is plain that the Government establishment of clergy is wholly inadequate to meet the wants of the scattered and increasing Christian population which I have tried to describe. It is indeed designed primarily for the servants of Government, but this principle can only be observed very roughly. India is not divided into two regions, one occupied by Government officials, and one by independent settlers: if a settler live near a station where a regiment is quartered, or which is on other grounds sufficiently important to have a chaplain, he can of course claim the benefit of his services. If a company of soldiers or small body of civilians, are placed at a remote out-station, they probably find no chaplain there. Still, speaking generally, as the chaplains are placed where there are regiments or large civil establishments, and as the settlers and non-official class frequently live in parts of the country distant from these, we may say with tolerable correctness, that the work of the chaplains lies with the soldiers and Government officials, and that the scattered Europeans must be provided for by the independent action of the Church. Government has no intention of

making its Ecclesiastical Establishment commensurate with the wants of all the Europeans in India, nor is it desirable that this should be done. In former days, when a comfortable family party was assembled under the paternal care of old John Company, and when no independent European could reside in the country without a license, no clergy were perhaps required, except for Missionary purposes, beyond those sent out by Government. But it would be fatal to the growth, the activity, the zeal of the Church to act now on such a principle. A Church depending wholly on Government for support must soon become a dead Church: its clear duty is to extend and develop itself from within. This I trust that the Anglican Church in India is earnestly trying to do, though considering the difficulties arising from increased prices, the diminution (I trust only temporary) of attachment to the country on the part of the European residents, the frequent illnesses and consequent changes of the clergy, the sudden and rapid multiplication of spiritual wants, the absence of endowments, and the great variety of objects for benevolent enterprise, we are obliged to look occasionally for help to the mother Church at home. The two great needs of the scattered Europeans and Eurasians are of course (1) an increase of clergy, and (2) schools for their children.

With regard to pastoral ministrations, very little help can be expected, or ought to be asked, from the Missionaries. They form a numerous and important body, but their work lies with the Natives, who are yearly making more and more urgent demands on their time and care. I cannot, indeed, speak too gratefully of the readiness with which, in any station where no clergyman is appointed expressly for Europeans, the Missionary, if there is one, adds the English service, and in any emergency pastoral visiting, to his self-denying labours in his own peculiar sphere. In Calcutta itself the Christian denizens of the House of Industry and Leper Asylum are necessarily dependent on the Missionaries of the Church Missionary Society for an English service every Sunday, and frequent visits during the week. But, speaking generally, the Missionaries must not be troubled by ministrations to Europeans: whatever they do in English is taken from time which would otherwise be given to the study and use of the native language, or some other work fitting them for their high calling as evangelists to the heathen. It is essential to meet European wants by wholly independent agencies.

Of these the chief is the Diocesan Additional Clergy Society, founded by Bishop Wilson in 1841. So vigorously has it set itself to work to meet the exigencies of the time, that during the seven years in which I have known its operations the number of stations which it has taken on its list, and which either are, or as we expect immediately will be, duly furnished with church, parsonage, and pastor, has risen from 4 to 21. The support of these clergy entirely exhausts, or rather more than exhausts, all its regular income; especially since it has appropriated a part to the formation of a fund for the purpose of giving a pension of £100 a year to each of its clergy after a certain term of service. But it has lately thrown out certain branches in connexion with the Railways. As the Companies are debarred from voting monies for religious purposes out of their corporate funds, appeals have lately been sent to the shareholders of

the two principal lines, asking for a certain percentage on their dividends for one or two years, to serve as an endowment fund for permanently founding certain incumbencies, as it were, or perpetual curacies, at those stations which will be at once the chief centres of their European servants, and least accessible to the chaplains or other clergy. The sums already contributed from the shareholders of the East India line will enable us to place two additional pastors between Allahabad and Delhi, and I am waiting anxiously for the answer to the other appeal, in the hope of establishing a third at the railway station at Lahore. To the funds already collected the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, with its usual thoughtful liberality, though usually limiting its operations in India to purely missionary work, has promised an addition of £1000, and any extraneous help to this great object will be thankfully welcomed. The funds, though vested in the trusteeship of the Bishop and Archdeacon of Calcutta, will be administered through the agency of the Additional Clergy Society, and the Railway clergy will be entitled to its pensions and other advantages.

I should rejoice very much if a similar appeal could be made, with a good prospect of success, to the shareholders in any of the great Tea companies, especially in Assam, and I am the more ready to hope that this may be so, because I heard last year of some spontaneous movement of the kind in England; on which I will only remark that any such efforts for the spiritual good of India, in connexion with the Anglican Church, are more likely to be economically conducted, and fitted into our general diocesan arrangements, if they are managed in communication with the Archdeacon and myself, than by independent efforts, often most kindly conceived, but not always carried out with a practical knowledge of our existing wants and agencies. It is, of course, plain that the shareholders in all commercial companies, whether for making railways or developing our agricultural resources, who send a large number of Europeans into India to carry out their designs and increase their revenues, are bound to provide the means of grace for their fellow Christians in their employ, just as it is the duty of the head of a Christian family to gather his servants for common worship, and just as some master manufacturers in England have set a noble example of interest in the highest welfare of their workmen. But I fear that this duty is not as yet so far recognised as to enable us to effect what is wanted, without some aid from the general benevolence of the Church; especially as many of the shareholders, being Hindoos, Mahometans, and Jews, can hardly be expected to subscribe to Christian objects.

Then again, the city of Calcutta has wants of its own. A vast number of sailors, amounting, it is said, in busy times of the year to 25,000 souls, is gathered in its port; a shifting population, no doubt, but one which requires and deserves our best efforts, since they land on our quays often wholly unprepared for the dangers of the climate, and still more of the vile Indian liquors, and other abominations, by which they are brought to disease and death as soon as they enter the streets and bazaars of the native town. And besides these claimants of our sympathy and help, we have a large semi-native population, baptised into the Christian faith, descended generally from the Portuguese or

their slaves, chiefly but not exclusively Roman Catholics, painfully ignorant, almost heathenish in some of their superstitions, holding lawless notions about marriage and other Christian ordinances, often unable to speak English, and from these peculiarities requiring a special ministry of their own, since their *patois* makes them inaccessible to the chaplains, and their profession of Christianity removes them from the sphere of the missionaries. Measures have been taken to place two clergymen among the sailors, and one among this other class, but owing to the manifold impediments of sickness and change, which sorely interrupt all Indian arrangements, they are at present but imperfectly carried out.

With regard to the education of Christian children, I may roughly divide our Europeans and Eurasians into nearly the same sections as those into which I distributed them in reference to their religious wants. As the chaplains are appointed to minister especially (though not exclusively) to Government servants and to the army, so for both these classes the means of education exist. The children of the wealthier among our English residents will always, and wisely, be sent to England, though it is possible, if some of the schemes presently to be mentioned prosper, that the necessary separation between parents and children,—the chief sorrow of Anglo-Indian life,—may be delayed for a few years. So again, the wants of soldiers' children are provided for, partly by regimental schools, and still more efficiently by the "Asylums" in the hills, which bear the honoured name of their originator, Sir Henry Lawrence. Of these, two exist in this diocese, the one at Sanawur, about 33 miles from Simla, and the other at Murree, the summer head-quarters of the Government of the Punjab. There remains, therefore, the children of the numerous and widely-scattered population, in whose welfare I have tried to interest the Congress when writing on the want of clergy. Except in the cities of Calcutta and Lucknow, there was till lately scarcely any provision for the education of their sons and daughters. But recently vigorous endeavours have been made to remedy this grave defect by two closely connected schemes. The one is the institution of a Diocesan Board of Education, consisting of six clergymen and six laymen, with the Bishop as its president. The other is the foundation and endowment of three boys' schools at three stations in the Himalayas; one in each of the three principal provinces into which this vast presidency is divided—Simla for the Punjab, Mussoorie for the North-West, and Darjeeling for Bengal. These three hill schools are chiefly designed for the sons of the middle class, and will correspond, it is hoped, to the grammar schools which Edward VI. scattered over the length and breadth of England. The Diocesan Board, while it is largely helping the foundation of the hill schools, finds its chief work in encouraging the establishment of schools for a poorer class in the great cities of the plains; for, of course, the majority of the parents for whom we are providing cannot afford the expense of long journeys to the Himalayas. The Board has already, during the three years of its existence, assisted in establishing day schools for boys in Calcutta and Lahore, and for children of both sexes at Rangoon, Allahabad, and Howrah. It has also contributed largely to the foundation of three boarding schools for girls—one at Monghyr, a pleasant station

on the East India Railway in the plains of Behar; the other two in the Himalayas, at Simla and Mussoorie. The last-named, indeed, has been transferred to the Board altogether, so that its members are the governors of the school and hold the property in trust. Thus a connected and systematic scheme is in operation, by which we may in time hope to remove the reproach which was too long attached to the English Church in India, that, with very trifling exceptions, the only institutions at which European and Eurasian children could be educated were attached to Roman Catholic convents.

The Congress will have been wearied before this of these dry statistical details, and will heartily wish that I had rather set before them the more interesting matter which I mentioned at the beginning of my paper. I will therefore add, in further vindication of the course actually adopted, that the work for which I am seeking sympathy is directly connected with those other schemes to which some of our friends feel more especially attracted;—the increase of the Episcopate in India, and the conversion of its heathen population. With regard to the first, it would be impossible to place in this country a new Anglican bishop having diocesan jurisdiction, without the consent of Parliament, for as the Legislature has already declared that British India is to be split into *three* dioceses, no less potent authority can divide it into *four*. The only relief which the Church by its unassisted efforts can afford to the present diocesans, would be to consecrate a *Chorepiscopus*, or coadjutor, to each, specially charged with the care of the native Christians, and therefore leaving the diocesan bishop more free for his work among the Europeans. But in the erection of new independent sees, as the law now stands, the State has a controlling voice, and nothing would so convincingly prove to Parliament their necessity, and so persuasively induce wealthy Churchmen to assist in their endowment, as the sight of English churches, congregations, and pastors, multiplying all over India, and clearly needing visitation, government and fatherly counsel. And with regard to that greatest of all the duties of England to India, the conversion of the people to the faith of Christ, if it is true that one of the chief hindrances to that conversion is the sight of the careless or wicked lives of professing Christians, we see at once that a double blessing attends their rescue from such lives, through the ministrations of a faithful pastor or the education of a good school. They will not only themselves be “brands plucked out of the fire,” but the sight of their Christian lives will lead the heathen around them to inquire more deeply into the principles which are elevating and sanctifying a society hitherto degraded and corrupt.

Should any hearer of this paper be roused by these details to a desire of promoting any of the above schemes, I will only say that the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel is always ready to transmit to any bishop money specially given for the benefit of his diocese: that my commissary is the Rev. G. Burn, vicar of Hatfield, Broad Oak, Essex; and that our treasurer in England for various diocesan objects is my brother-in-law, Henry Tomkinson, Esq., 7, Lower Seymour street, Portman-square, London. Through any one of these three channels help can be sent to us, on the one hand, towards our educational plans, and, on the other, towards the provision of pastors

for families connected with railways, or for our scattered settlers and tea-planters, or for the poor of this city, with its large population of ignorant nominal Christians, and its thousands of sailors constantly arriving and departing from every part of the world.

I have almost insensibly glided into that appeal for money, which is, I suppose, the conclusion, avowed or implied, of nearly all the sermons, lectures, and other utterances, written or spoken, of every Indian and every colonial bishop. It seems a lame and impotent conclusion of the solemn subjects of which I have been treating ;—of all that has been said about exiles from the Church's care, and neglected children, and baptized Christians forgetful alike of baptismal privilege and obligation. But it is unfortunately a very necessary one, for unless God puts it into the hearts of many to supply India with the means of meeting its increasing wants, the English Church cannot fulfil the duties which it owes to the most magnificent dependency of the English Crown. It may, however, perhaps give a little more spiritual life to my last words if I add that, besides money, we want men, and that the same two friends, whom I have mentioned as willing to receive money, will also be able to tell any one desirous of pastoral or educational work in India what employment can be offered at any particular time by the Additional Clergy Society, or the Diocesan Board, or any other of the minor agencies at work among us. Only this much let me say to any who may be disposed to inquire for such work : although they will not be Missionaries, properly so called, yet I trust that no one will come to India except in a missionary spirit. For not only ought every Christian in this country to be, if not by direct preaching, yet by life, example, kindness, and sympathy, an evangelist to the heathen, but all the circumstances of India, the responsibilities and opportunities of England in connexion with it, the frequency of sudden deaths and broken health, the actual presence of a gigantic system of heathenism, with the great Mahometan heresy by its side, the flood of new ideas which is undermining both, the vastness and variety of the work to be done, the frivolity, worldliness, and manifold immoralities within the visible Church, against which Christ's servants have to struggle, the amount of hardship and self-denial which all must expect in this climate, may well deter any one from seeking employment here in a light or careless way, and without a deep conviction that it is vain to look for success unless he faithfully and deliberately takes unto him the whole armour of God. On the other hand, I would not have it thought that I say this to deter any one from coming here. I am sure by experience much happiness is to be found in India, and in no country is work offered of deeper and more varied interest ; the very difficulties, which are overwhelming discouragements to a careless and energetic labourer, will increase the zeal and devotion of one differently minded, lessening the mortification of failure, and enhancing the joy of success, so that no where is it more true than here that "Great is the glory, for the strife is hard."

G. E. L., CALCUTTA.

At the time this paper was read the writer had himself furnished another illustration of the "frequency of sudden death," to which he refers. The Bishop was drowned in the Ganges on the evening of the 6th October, and the sad intelligence reached York by telegraph the day after the Congress broke up.

DISCUSSION.

THE DEAN of CAPE TOWN said:—In the remarks which I am about to make on the Colonial Churches, I shall endeavour to remove misconceptions which still too commonly prevail, and to point out the nature of their position as compared with that of the Church which has founded them. The Colonial Churches—I speak especially for one, but yet I speak for all because the cause and the feelings of all are one—the Colonial Churches have no precarious love of independence, and no desire of severance from the mother Church. On the contrary, they cling to the Church of England with very great tenacity. They look to the Church of England as their mother, and they love her as a mother only can be loved. Of the clergy, many have left home and friends in obedience to her call upon them, all are cheered and supported in the trials of their several positions by the thought that they are spreading her influence, and, in that, the kingdom and the power of Him, whose cause is hers. It is, therefore, more than injustice, it is almost cruelty, and cruelty of the finest and keenest order, to speak of these clergy or churches as if wanting in fidelity and devotion to her. As well might men accuse our soldiers as wanting in affection to their country when they go to foreign lands to fight her battles and lay down their lives in her defence. The Churches of the Colonies will never forsake their mother. The danger rather is, that the mother, mistaking the position and special trials of her children, and forgetting how essential her protection is during the first stages in their history, may not be prompt enough to aid them in the perils of their infancy, and give them that help which for a time they need. The difference between the two positions is this. The mother Church and the daughter Churches are one in all essentials; one in body, one in spirit. But in accidents they differ. The mother Church is Catholic and national. I mean by national, recognized by law as the Church of the nation, and having the aid of the State in executing its laws. The regulations of the Church of England adopted by the Government, are also the laws of the realm. The daughter Churches, on the other hand, are Catholic and not national. They are voluntary associations, having their place beyond the sphere of law, so that the law of the realm knows nothing of their existence or operations, except as it knows of any private society which it overlooks and tolerates, but not controls. And what we say is this—If we have no essential relations to law, we must never be treated as if we had. From first to last, from base to steeple, we must be dealt with as a voluntary body. The State must leave us to ourselves. Every nature, every creature, every thing must be treated always according to its constituent idea, its defining principle, its formative law. Otherwise its growth will be stunted, or, if mistreated too far, its life will be destroyed. If the laws of a Church are laws of the realm, treat the Church on that idea in *all* its regulative functions. If a Church is voluntary, beyond law, treat it as beyond law in *all* its acts and operations. Do not try to form an abnormal creature, with a voluntary body and an involuntary head. If you do, you will fail, or you will make a monster which nature will not tolerate, and which man will not allow to live. I mean, it will not do to step in at a certain point and say—You are voluntary so far, and now you must leap a chasm, and pass at one great bound from being a voluntary society to becoming an involuntary society, guarded and controlled by law; least of all may this be done at the stage which finally determines discipline. Law, when wedded to catholicity, must move in union with catholicity, or should so move, wherever it moves at all. Catholicity in single estate, must live in singleness while life lasts. That, then, is our position. Our mother has been united with the State. The State of England and the Church of England have been joined together, for better for worse, for many centuries. Together they have weathered many a storm, fought many a battle, suffered much and done much for that island which is their home. We, her children, are not united to any State. For good or for evil, not from any act of our own, but from the will of God and the circumstances of our time and country, the Colonial Church is not joined to any nationality. Kings are not our nursing fathers; queens are not our nursing mothers. Speaking for the Colonial Church generally, and not forgetting exceptions which are not considerable, the State has done next to nothing for us. We have no special privileges; no tithes; no endowments, except such as are shared by other religious bodies. There are disadvantages in this state, but the state is not that which we choose; it is chosen for us. And there are advantages, which compensate—perhaps I might say which largely compensate—for what we have not. And we claim the advantages of our

unrecognized and unestablished position, whatever these may be, while we bear with our disadvantages, whatever these may be, also. We say, if we are free, we will act as free, we will build up a system which originates in freedom and ends in freedom. If we are not regulars we will be volunteers; we will manage our own concerns from first to last. Not so, say some. Build your ship, lay its keel, set up its sides, erect the masts, spread the sails; but, considering the advantages of union with a national Government, allow the law and the crown to put on the rudder, and, as a recompense for their patronage and recognition, permit the State to be the guide and director of the whole ship. Now, we say, that to insist on this, as many do insist, is mere tyranny, and that we cannot, and will not have it on any terms, or at any price. We must build and guide our ship on the principle with which we started. We were voluntary at the beginning; we will be voluntary to the last. And I will add, this is philosophy, this is reason, this is common sense. I believe, too, that the mind of England, which moves slowly and cumbrously but truly, will come round at last to see that what we claim is fair and just. But then comes the real question. How shall a Church which is in union with the State of England be one in action and discipline with Churches which are no part of the national system and life? How shall a society which is national as well as Catholic be quite one with a society which is Catholic without being national? The difficulty is not unreal. To those indeed who regard the Church as the mere creation of the State it is insuperable. If the Church lives by the will of man and by the permission of Kings and Parliaments,—if nationality is its marrow and essence,—Churches which owe nothing to governments and are beyond the sphere of law, cannot be one with a Church which is their mere servant. And this is the real explanation of that illiberal, and, I may say, intolerant resistance which our just claims have met. To those, however, who believe that the Church is independent of circumstances, having its real life in some higher sphere existing by the will of Him whose presence is its life,—Catholicity being its essence and nationality an accident, important indeed, but separable,—the difficulty the longer it is looked at fades away into less and less. Let me say then, and say in all boldness and plainness, as one who speaks before brethren upon a matter of the vastest significance—the union and co-operation of the mother and her daughters is easy and simple, if the mother will but be true to her essential Catholicity, and say by all her conduct, that dear as nationality may be, faith and truth and God's Word are so dear and so vital that they must be kept at all costs and held at the price of every sacrifice. Indeed it may well be asked if any less courageous policy, domestic as well as foreign, can long maintain the nationality. The Church of England will keep her hold upon the nation only if she makes her liberty respected and her name and power felt. But then it is said that the Churches of the Colonies will break up into mere fragments, if there is no great central force which shall keep them together, and that the only force which can do this is that of law. I admit the danger. The Colonial Churches are quite alive to it themselves. Some of them, it may be, have already done acts which will hamper them in their future progress, because principles have been broken, and things which may not change have been rudely touched. Something, no doubt, is needed. Something must be done to bind us together, and keep us to unchanging principles. But State-made law is not the bond which can unite us. The chain which men may try to make a girdle for the earth, must snap at the first strain which comes upon it. Only a spiritual bond can have at once that strength and elasticity which can hold a world together. Our security for union is not the law of man but the presence of the One Lord and the One Spirit: "Lo, I am with you always even to the end of the world." That is our bond of union and that only. The One Lord by whom the Church lives may use law as His instrument, when Church and State are one, but law is his servant not his master; and if secular law fails spiritual law suffices. Would that we could see this. If we could, if the Church of England as a body could but see it, what great life would she put forth, with what a giant's strength would she rise up before the nations. These many Churches, daughters of the Church of England, born to her in this reviving age, which we might almost call a second Pentecost, bursting with such fresh life in these hot and eager days, when steam and electricity are narrowing space and drawing earth into a small and measurable compass, what may they not become, what may they not do, what may not the world derive from them, and what above all, may not the mother be, if that mother will only see her opportunity, and accept that world-wide heritage which Christ her Lord has all but placed within her hands? Oh! what a future is before the Church of England, if she will but be true to herself, and snatch the occasion as it passes! Will she be a second Jerusalem? Will she become a mother of nations? Will she go with that pure tradition of the faith, and that ancient Apostolic order which God, in

His mercy, has entrusted to her, and will she give it to the nations? Will she become the hope of the world and the uniter of a distracted Christendom? In this seething and tumultuous time when judgments are abroad, and kingdoms pass away like a burning scroll, and earth reels beneath the influences which shake it, when it seems as if society was growing too old to live long, and when time itself wears out, as if dying before the powers which contract and shorten it, will the Church of England see her great mission, and go to fit the world for Him who comes, we know not how soon? Will she do this? I believe that she will. I believe that she will never shrivel up into the coldness of a paltry nationality, or justify the slanders of her enemies when they call her the creature of Parliaments, and the barometer which registers the fluctuations of the national mind and will.

MR. E. B. COWELL: The subject for our discussion this evening embarrasses by its very extent, for England's Colonial Church and her Mission fields are wide as the world. I would, however, confine my few remarks this evening to one part of her mission field—India—but it is a portion peculiarly connected with us, and peculiarly interesting from the present circumstances of its religious condition. India is now passing through a grave crisis in her history, and one which we hardly realise at home. We have been giving her sons a high education of a purely secular character; but I think it is well for us to bear in mind that this may be a cause for apprehension quite as much as congratulation. We have established Universities with a systematic course of subordinate examinations, and the Hindus have proved by their tested attainments that those institutions were not founded prematurely—they have successfully passed the ordeals and won the different distinctions to be conferred. We have Bachelors and Masters of Arts from our Calcutta University; these become the deputy magistrates and pleaders in our courts; and we are thus training the upper classes in all the science and learning of modern Europe. But unless the Church comes in to supplement the fatal defect in our education as given by the State, I fear we may only be preparing a tremendous danger for the future. The cloud that is rising in India may descend in fruitful showers, but it may also descend in thunderstorms. The Government, situated as it is, cannot give the religious element, without which all this secular training is useless—nay, pernicious; but this only renders it all the more imperatively the duty of our Church to follow with her efforts and influence, so that the education of the Hindus may not be left thus perilously deficient. In this way we may hope that all this secular training may be rendered a preparatory agent for Christianity, instead of leading only to some such semi-paganized *renaissance* as that which rose in Italy under the Medici. My few words may perhaps not be in vain, if I urge, at the present meeting, this great duty which rests on our Church. If we do not undertake it, it must be left undone. I think we do not realise how much in many respects the intellectual atmosphere of Bengal resembles that of England. The same phase of thought is prevalent there which we find so prevalent at home,—the same speculative difficulties are started,—the same questions discussed. Every new book which has a run in England is soon carried over to India, and in two months' time is as current among our educated Hindus as among ourselves. India is nearer than we think to England, and our responsibilities to India are proportionately increased. India is now passing through an intellectual and moral crisis; and it is for the Christian Church to do her utmost at the present opportunity to impart to the Government education that religious element which she alone can give.

THE BISHOP OF PENNSYLVANIA: In the providence of God my voice has been hushed in His house for the last eight months through ill-health, and this is the first time since January last that I have attempted to speak to any assembly of my fellow-men. Little did I anticipate that I should be called to say anything to-day; but I came because my heart bounded at the word "missions." If there is one subject which above all others moves my heart and awakens my deepest emotions, it has always been that of the missions of that branch of the Church of Christ of which I have the honour to be a humble bishop. Thirty-one years ago, at a General Convention of the American Church, it was declared that the Church of Christ was a missionary body, and that henceforth there should be no distinction made between home and foreign Missions, but that they should be considered as two great branches of the same tree, and in that spirit the work of missions has been carried on in our Church ever since. I rejoice in being present to witness this thrilling scene, to be received with so much heartiness by this assembly, and to have held out to me by my episcopal brethren here the right hand of fellowship. Let me assure you that the heart of every Churchman in America will gratefully respond to your words of greeting;

and I speak the sentiments of the whole American Church when I say that its heart beats in unison with the great heart of the Church of England. England has been spoken of repeatedly as the mother of nations, but she is also the mother of Churches, and we in America rejoice to be called her daughter Church. We are her daughter, and we bless God that we have such a glorious mother. We have the same Liturgy, we carry on our heads the same consecration, we bear on our shield the same device, and we go forth to fight the same battle of our common Lord. It is an interesting and literal fact that I and my episcopal brethren here with me to-day are the ecclesiastical great-grandchildren of the sees of York and Canterbury. In 1784, as you will find recorded in the admirable History of the American Church, published by my right rev. friend in the Chair, three persons were selected by the Church in America and sent over to this country for the purpose, so that the first three Bishops of the American Church, from whom we as Bishops are lineally descended, were consecrated at Lambeth by the Archbishops of York and Canterbury and the Bishops of Bath and Peterborough. Are we not, then, the daughter Church of England? And when I stand on this platform and see around me Bishops and clergy from every part of the globe, I have a visible proof that the Church of England is indeed the mother of Churches. It brings to my mind one of those great banyan trees under which I have stood in the far East, which has a great sturdy trunk, sending out its branches on all sides, which, dropping again to the earth, take root and send out in like manner other branches, until at length, spreading wider and wider, under its ample shade an army might be gathered. Thus the Church of England is the spiritual banyan tree of the world. Its chief root and trunk are fixed in this glorious old isle; and the branches may be found taking root in every land, sending out other branches until, by and by, the world will be covered by the shade of the glorious old episcopal tree of England. We feel grateful for the kind reception we have met with here, and we shall go back with such a report as will stir up in our churches feelings of deeper love for and greater union with the Church of England. There has recently been laid a small thread across the great Atlantic, binding two great countries together by an electric cord which will materially enhance the prosperity of each; but that is as nothing to that electric cable which has been laid at this Congress, by the presence of three American Bishops, between this Church and her daughter across the Atlantic; we shall convey back to our own country the electric thrill of love and joy and welcome with which we have been received.

MR. BERESFORD-HOPE, M.P.: The main object of this Congress is to consult together as to how we can best meet practical difficulties. Now there are two great practical difficulties before us to-night: that which relates to the Colonial Church has been so well handled by the Dean of Cape Town that I will only refer to the other one—the question of Missions to the Heathen. Mr. Garbett, in his paper, described the system of missions in different ages as diverse and inconsistent. If that were so, the inconsistency would, in itself, account for some difficulties; but I contend that the imputation has no warrant in ecclesiastical history. The system of missions has ever been as it ought to be diverse but not inconsistent. “Diverse, but consistent” ought to be the motto of missions, for it epitomises their history. The Christian Church began in an upper room with only the Twelve and He, the Lord of all; and how was the Christian Church to be spread over all the civilised world from such a beginning? How could the work of missions, while the Christians were a small persecuted sect, worshipping in the dens and corners of the earth, in caves and catacombs, be anything but individual and isolated? Up to the time when it was accepted and recognised by the powers of the earth—up to the days of Constantine—Christianity could only deal with individual cases. But when in God’s good providence, in the fourth century, the revolution came and Christianity was seated on the throne of the Cæsars, was it not a common-sense deduction from the premises laid down by God Himself, that missions should take a different aspect—consistent, ever consistent in principle, while diverse in outward appearances—and preach at once and boldly to nations not to persons? Sometimes new churches were planted by crowned heads, sometimes by bishops, sometimes by laymen, sometimes by postulants for holy orders; but although the means used were diverse, they all tended to one consistent result—the setting up of Christ and Christ’s Church in its completion in that country. We must go back to the days of St. Paul to see what the diversity should be. Look at Athens, still (at least in its own eyes) the seat of the intellect and literary civilisation of the world; and what did St. Paul do there? He stood upon Mars Hill—Areopagus, the centre of the judicial and traditionary history of

Greece—and he appealed, not to the Hebrew Scriptures, for they would not have been understood, but to one of their own poets and to one of their own altars named to their unknown God. But when St. Paul went to Rome, the centre of the powers and government of the world, he got hope of those “of Cæsar’s household”—the chamberlains and lords in waiting of that dissolute court. That consistent diversity between St. Paul’s action at Athens and at Rome was an example of what ought at all times to be the practice of Christian missionaries. In fact the Christian missionary should recollect that when he has to deal with peoples, he has to mould and modify their former views to Christianity, and his best course is to appeal to that which he finds good amongst them, and condemn only that which is bad, to maintain the old national idolatry as a sacred deposit while he regenerates it by the newly given power of Christianity. He will accommodate his probationary restrictions to the learning, position, and state of those who are converted. Where the converts had but a small amount of learning, and were of low position, he would not require too much from them before he formally admitted them to the Christian fold; but in the case of priests and nobles, and men of education, he would require more. If he had to deal with a sovereign, he would be careful that cruelty, lust, and greediness were not only just garnished over with hypocritical professions made in the outburst of their very passions. The Christian missionary, minding the Apostolical injunction to be all things to all men so that souls may be won to Christ, should also remember in going to a nation, that it ever has been the policy of the Church to build upon the old foundations of the land, taking what is good, rejecting what is bad, and working up the old traditions. To put the difficulty in another way: it is obvious that the civilisation and subtle intellectualism of India and Persia require different treatment to that proper to more barbarous races; but it must always be remembered that while dealing with nations according to their own characteristics, the principles of faith and duty are inflexible, and that no compromise is possible in those things which the Gospel proclaims as essential.

THE BISHOP OF NEWFOUNDLAND: I cannot be too thankful for your kind reception of me, for I am aware that the presence of a Colonial Bishop is more or less distasteful to the British public. (No!) Please allow me to have eyes to see as well as ears to hear. I see in the papers and elsewhere remarks which make it impossible for me not to believe that an opinion is entertained that Colonial Bishops are too frequently absent from their dioceses, and that it would be better if they remained and did the work assigned to them. Now, I say that the kind reception you have given me shows that that feeling is not recognised on the present occasion. And while I rejoice for other reasons at the presence of my Episcopal brethren of the American Church, I feel that their presence throws a shield around us, and is a sort of justification of our presence here also. I do not think this feeling arises from any personal antipathies, or from a concern on the part of the people of England for our poor deserted dioceses, but the real cause, I am well aware, is that we come more or less on a begging errand. Beggars are distasteful to those who do not choose to open their hearts and their pockets to every demand upon them. But there is another reason which makes many of you wince—it is, that Colonial Bishops come not to take away your money only, but some of your choicest men. Our greatest difficulty is to get good men to aid us in our colonies. Fathers and mothers, sisters, and friends say, you must not go to Newfoundland, or you will be starved to death. That is the answer we frequently get when we make applications to the clergy to come over and help us. Many say they would gladly come, but their parents and friends object, and therefore they cannot gratify their own desires. Our want of money, and, still more, our want of men are reasons, then, which make our visits more or less distasteful to our brethren at home. You may ask in respect to the first, why can we not find the means of supporting our own clergymen at Newfoundland? The reason is peculiar, and one which does not apply to any other colonial diocese. All the principal merchants—those persons who gather up the wealth of the country—reside in England and Scotland. The wealth raised from our prolific seas does not remain with us, excepting only the small proportion paid for wages. It all goes to increase the riches of the wealthy people in Liverpool, Greenock, London, and other towns on this side of the Atlantic; and it is for this reason amongst others that we occasionally come here; though I beg to say that my own visits have not been very numerous. I venture to think that after many years of absence from relatives and friends it is not unreasonable that we should come occasionally for refreshment in body, soul, and spirit to our mother Church. The society there is but limited. We have no seasons of refreshing like this; when friend meets friend, and by mutual counsel

and encouragement each is strengthened for the work; so that we could gather up the fruits as it were of the progress making every day in wisdom and knowledge, but of which we know nothing, and of that which we know a portion is daily slipping from us. That is the cause why the poor Bishop of Newfoundland comes here at this time, and if I return to my diocese with nothing more than the welcome I have received to-night I shall not have come to this country in vain. I gladly accept the position given us by the reader of the second paper, who passed the Colonial Church by, because he considered it as part and parcel of the mother Church of England, and differing, therefore, from ordinary mission-fields; and I can, in reference to what has fallen from the Dean of Cape Town, honestly declare to you that nothing is so hateful to us as the idea of schism or separation from our dear mother Church at home. The special purpose of my visit is to see if I could not fill up a few vacant stations. I had the pleasure the other day of being present at the consecration of a church by the Bishop of Lichfield, who said that he had been bishop of that diocese twenty-two years, and he had great comfort in marking its improved condition in wealth, in civilisation, in the better state of the poor, and in the progress of the Church and of religious feeling. That remark struck a painful chord in my breast. I too have been a bishop twenty-two years; but during that time, I am sorry to say, the course of my diocese has been in an opposite direction in regard to material things; with respect to social life and the wealth of the country; and in the last five or six years it has retrograded rapidly—although I rejoice to be able to add there has been great improvement in the moral and religious character of the people. The Bishop of Lichfield said he had consecrated one hundred and fifty churches; I have consecrated between sixty and seventy; and the poor fishermen, who are not able to do much for the support of their clergy, do a great deal towards building new churches by their labour and other help; and when the churches are built they are glad to crowd into them, they enjoy the services, and rejoice the ministers by their kind and cordial demeanour towards them. I beg you to remember my poor diocese in your prayers.

THE BISHOP OF NORTH CAROLINA: I can honestly say I came to the Congress not to be a teacher, but simply to hear and to receive instruction on subjects of deep interest to all members of the Christian Church, and particularly to Christian Bishops. I rise only in deference to the request that I should say something; but I do not think I can add anything to the deliberations of this assembly. I have only one remark to make with regard to the subject for discussion. I belong to a nation considered to be eminently shrewd and practical, and I hope I may derive some benefit from my nationality in respect to those qualities. I wish, therefore, to give a practical aspect to the subject before us. I say then it is the duty of the Church from time to time to "take an observation," as they say in nautical matters, so that it may see how far it has advanced and where it is going. It is highly important to the Church of England that it should do this as regards the question of Missions; and in considering what it is now called upon to do, it may be well for it to see what it has lost by neglecting them. I believe that it was a neglect of its duty in respect to Missions that brought on the civil war which lost to England the American colonies. Of course eventually separation must have taken place—it is not in the nature of things that 30,000,000 of free people could continue the subjects of another power 3000 miles off. But this might have occurred—they might have separated by mutual consent and with just mutual affection. Sir Robert Walpole was a shrewd and practical man; and Bishop Berkeley, though a skilful metaphysician, had only the reputation of a theorist; but if the advice of the Utopian Christian Theorist had been taken, instead of that of the shrewd worldly-wise politician, England would have saved three hundred millions of her debt, and thousands upon thousands of her noblest lives. If the Church of England, however, calculates what she has gained and lost by Missions, she will find the gains far outweigh the losses. The vigorous shoots (to use my right rev. brother's metaphor) of the English banyan tree extend their branches far and wide; and the American Church, with all its own extensive ramifications, is proud to own her as its mother. And of all the bonds which bind the United States to England, there are none which tend so much to a good and cordial understanding, and which excite the sympathies and love of Churchmen towards the mother country, as that our Church and our organization have their origin in the Church of England. We love England for the sake of England's Church. We rejoice in the welfare of the Church of England; and we are also pleased when we can appeal to her practices in support of any action of our own.

THE CHAIRMAN: The time fixed to close our proceedings has arrived, and leaves

me no space to make any remarks. I will only just say this—I think the discussion we have had can hardly help but yield good fruit. I think, in the first place, there must be left on all our minds a sense of the vastness of this great work. Everything we have heard from our brethren in America and in our colonies—everything put before us in the papers read—shows the greatness of the subject. India, in the great extent of her territory—India, in the plenitude of her past neglect—India, in her unwritten future—must rise vast and gloomy before the eyes of every thinking man. The interests of all humanity have been shown to be involved in the peaceful relations of the two great English-speaking communities. The dangers have been sketched by a master hand of the attempt to govern our Colonial Church by any rules Downing-street red-tapeism can devise. We have heard that the weapons of our warfare are not to be carnal, but spiritual, and that in planting the Churches of Christ they must have the basis and the completeness of the Apostles' doctrine and discipline. These things have arisen before us, and I hope we shall be led to make this subject a greater matter of prayer and of self-sacrifice. We have, however, learnt two lessons—the one that it is our duty to the Great Head of the Church to accept this work as a real work to be done, and that without delay; the other, never to utter ourselves, or to accept from others, commonplaces on such a real subject. I believe the greatest danger that threatens this mighty work lies in the direction of half-heartedness. There is self-denial and faith enough to do the work if we could only avoid that wretched device of the enemy to freeze us up into a miserable state of half-exertion. I believe the danger lies in that direction. A frozen respectability in the Church at home cannot give life and cannot long keep life.

The right rev. prelate then pronounced the benediction.

CONGRESS HALL. WEDNESDAY MORNING.

His Grace the PRESIDENT in the Chair.

PREACHING. (DOGMATIC TEACHING FROM THE PULPIT.)

THE DEAN OF EMLY READ THE FOLLOWING PAPER:—

IN opening this discussion I must attempt a definition of its subject. Precise and definite knowledge of any kind can be formulated in precise and definite propositions. These propositions in theology are Dogmas. To assert that religion has no dogmas is to assert dogmatically that we know nothing about it. To us a dogma is the formal statement of a positive religious truth, received by the Church in general, or by our own Church in particular, and expressed, either in the language of Holy Scripture, or in language ecclesiastically sanctioned as representative of the substance of Holy Scripture.¹ By dogmatic teaching from the pulpit I understand the teaching of dogma thus defined.

I. Dogmatic teaching, in some measure and upon some occasions, is required from all of us. Every clergyman of our Church is the minister of a system, not indeed of limitless dogmatism like that of Rome, but still of a dogmatic system. We are not only committed to it morally by our subscription. Year after year between Advent and Trinity we must proclaim to our parishioners certain *facts*. No distinction can be drawn between these facts as “external accessories,” and certain supposed “essential ideas” of Christianity.² The facts, with their inseparable moral and spiritual significance, *are* the great

(1) I find that this definition agrees substantially with that of Schleiermacher, *Outlines of Theology*, p. 130, English Translation.

(2) The late Mr. Baden Powell in *Essays and Reviews*, p. 94. See Archdeacon Lee on the fallacy of the distinction, *On Miracles*, p. 5.

dogmas of the faith. We repeat creeds the least developed of which is dogmatic. The worship which we lead is a tissue, almost each thread of which is dyed in dogmatic colours. Every *Gloria Patri* wakens up echoes from the old dogmatic battle-fields of the faith. In every Litany the invocations are not addressed to an "abstract God, who is a solitary monarch, exiled beyond the limits of His creation to the desert throne of a silent eternity." Their language is dogmatic. "O God the Father, God the Son, God the Holy Ghost; O Holy, Blessed, and Glorious Trinity, three Persons and one God." Bishop Taylor's *Advice to his Clergy* evidently gives us the *minimum* of dogmatic teaching required from us. "Let every preacher in his parish take care to explicate to the people the mysteries of the great festivals, . . . because these feasts, containing in them the great fundamentals of our faith, will with most advantage convey the mysteries to the people, and fix them in their memories by the solemnity and circumstances of the day."

The performance of this simple duty brings with it, in an uncontroversial form, a supply to the three great religious wants of our day. The *first* of these is a definite object of worship. It is extensively held that subjective religion does not depend upon objective; that worship derives its worth from the subject in whom it resides, not from the object to whom it is directed. If the ark to which prayer rises be empty, what matter? Religion then may be an illusion of the subject thinking. The answer of such thinkers to the charge of constructive atheism is this:—the Atheist disbelieves in God: I am not an Atheist: the Theist believes in God: I am not a Theist: I am neither for nor against, I neither believe nor disbelieve. I simply know nothing about the matter as a fact, whatever I may feel as a sentiment. The best way for the preacher to meet the state of mind which worships it knows not what, is to bring it face to face with those dogmatic truths which teach us to know what we worship. A *second* great want is an antidote to that disbelief in the possibility of the miraculous which is atheistic in its essence. May it not be that we have dealt with this too much by evidential sermons, in which we have seemed to separate the works from the Worker, the miracles from the Person? May it not be that wise dogmatic teaching on the Person of our Lord will meet difficulties that metaphysics cannot solve? Given a Being like the Christ of our Creed. The supernatural, so to speak, becomes natural to Him. The works of Christ are such works as it was natural for one like Christ to do. At all events, there are two ways of treating the question of miracles. One ascends from the miracles to Christ, the other descends from Christ to the miracles. The one says, He wrought them; therefore He is Divine; the other says, He is Divine, therefore He wrought them. Let us not overlook the last. A *third* great want of the age is an adequate theory of the Person of our Lord. All round us there is a confused din of voices, attempting to answer the question, "What think ye of Christ?" Why is the great dogmatic prologue, whose precision no Council ever rivalled, and no philosophy ever surpassed, prefixed to St. John's Gospel? Simply because it is the one Divinely given point of view which co-ordinates all the elements of the problem in that life. And we must state and prove the dogma of the Incar-

nation from our pulpits, because the Christ of the Book can only be understood by the Christ of the Creed. Thus by simply following the great lines of the dogmatic track cut out for us by the Church, our preaching will be specially adapted to the deepest wants of the age. The best way to prove the Christian faith is to state it well. It will prove itself to souls whom our proofs might have never reached.—(Fénélon, *Dialogue sur l'Eloquence*.)

We may safely advance our claims beyond this. Dogmatic teaching should not only state single dogmas; it should attempt to exhibit their connexion and harmony. Religion is the only subject which even those who know its importance are content to teach in a thoroughly unsystematic way. We instruct the young of our flock in the Catechism, some of us, no doubt, very admirably, though the general results are scarcely a subject for boasting. So far as our public teaching is concerned, we afterwards leave them to such knowledge as they may acquire from detached sermons, full of elementary terms which have never been explained to them. In the course of our ministry it might be profitable for our parishioners, perhaps for ourselves, to undertake series of consecutive sermons upon the Apostles' or Nicene Creed, upon the Catechism (since public catechising seems almost impossible in a general way), and even upon the Articles. A popular exposition of the last might have one peculiar advantage. The great controversy of the pulpit is with sin. It is not desirable to hear perpetually the noise of archers in the places of drawing water. Yet there are times when the enemy threatens our people, or when perhaps we, their leaders, are taunted with treachery. At such times, the hand of the priest should take down the spears and shields that are in the temple of the Lord.³

II. The sermons which we are called upon to preach are not restricted only to the great festivals, and to occasional courses upon our chief dogmatic formularies. Hence there arises an important question, How far are our sermons generally to be dogmatic? We turn for instruction to the teaching of our Blessed Lord. The greatest portion of that teaching was spiritual and moral. In the four Evangelists it assumes three phases, distinctly marked as the rings within the oak. The first is chiefly moral, the second is chiefly parabolic, the third is chiefly prophetic of the coming Passion and Resurrection. Even in the fourth Gospel, the dogmatic element appears in different proportions, as it is drawn out by the opposition of His enemies—(see St. John v. 17, vi. 35, x. 30)—or adapted to the capacities of his hearers. Thus, compare the amount of dogma in our Lord's conversation with Nicodemus with that imparted to the woman of Samaria. The ruler of the Jews is led on at once to the dogmatic depths of the Incarnation and Redemption. (St. John iii. 13, 16, 17.) The ignorant schismatic receives more gradual and limited dogmatic teaching—iv. 24, 26—42. Let us consider again the doctrine of the Trinity as we find it in the Epistles. The apostolic writers give us the separate propositions which make up the complex dogma—or materials for forming them—rather than the collective and generalised proposition which the Church has legitimately deduced from them (see Chalmers'

(3) Ex dogmatica haurienda est notitia veritatum et mysteriorum fidei . . . nec tantum veritates singillatim intelligendæ, sed etiam eorum connectio et harmonia.—Schouppe, *Adjumenta Orationis Sacre*, p. 4.

Prelections, Posthumous Works, vol. ix., 225, 226), moulding them under the fires of heresy. Yet it should be noted that in every portion of our Saviour's teaching, even in the Synoptics, the dogmatic element is present, though it may be latent. Thus, in the Sermon on the Mount, behind the words, "Many will say unto me in that day, Lord, Lord . . . and then will I profess I never knew you," are the dogmas of Christ's Divinity and of the Judgment. Thus, in the third part of His teaching, the dogma of Redemption gives the interpretation of the Cross, which we see standing out with such awful distinctness at the end of the long defile of the Agony and Passion, "The Son of Man came to give His life a ransom for many." If, in the Epistles, "the Trinity is spoken of chiefly from its economical side, the ontological relationship lies at the root of it."—Döllinger, *The First Age of the Church*, vol. i., 241.

The conclusions which seem to follow are these. First, that dogmatic subjects are not always to be brought forward in set form and *ex professo*. Those expositions of Scripture which Bacon calls *solutæ* are to have their ample space beside those which are *methodical*. But, secondly, even in subjects which might seem at first sight to be undogmatic, the preacher who is not in possession of the dogmatic idea will wander round the circumference, and never find the centre of truth. The subjects for sermons have been divided into dogmatic, moral, ascetic (Schouppe, pp. 4, 5), or dogmatic, moral, historical, natural, psychological (Vinet. Homiletics, pp. 55, 73). But the dogmatic is not so much a different kind as the fixed pole round which the others turn. Its importance, whether in Scripture or our teaching, is not exactly to be measured by its bulk. The scale of proportion at the foot of the map is less than the map itself.

III. It may be well to speak of some of the *dangers* which we have to avoid in our dogmatic teaching.

1. The first and most obvious of these may be called *traditionalism*.

That dogmas should become lifeless is but one instance of a general law of human language. One of the chief functions of language is that it is a summary of human experience, the preserver, in a concentrated form, of thoughts, observations, results. But one tendency of general terms is to part with a portion of their signification. Thus, important fragments of the truths contained in a proposition may fade from the mind of an individual, or even of a generation. But, though faded, it is not obliterated, so long as the formula survives (*Mill's Logic*, ii. 252). The principle applies directly to theological dogma. Every earnest preacher must feel that there are souls in his congregation to whom those dogmas have become lifeless, yet who cling to them like those weeds and shell-fish of which we are told that they derive no sustenance from the substances to which they adhere. But how is the preacher to meet this? Shall he say with the excellent Chalmers—"The scholastic (meaning, as the context shows, the dogmatic) ought *instantly* to be superseded by the Scriptural in the pulpit work of the ministry" (*Chalmers's works*, ix. 232). Surely not. The dogmatic, in the true sense, is the Scriptural moulded into another form. It is inconsistent to take dogma with one hand as the exact expression of the mind of Scripture, and fling it away with the other, because it is not in Scripture words. By throwing away the dogma

we shall gain nothing but harm and loss. Words are the notes of things, and when the notes are lost the things go with them. That we are justified by faith only is a dogma of the Church, and has often become a lifeless dogma, with a network of scholasticism woven round it. But there was a time when the dogma was lost. "*Dedidicit linguam suam Ecclesia inter monachos,*" says Melancthon. "*Nihil adversariis nostris significat hæc oratio Pauli, Fide justificamur Diuturna servitus Ecclesiæ apud monachos linguam mutavit. . . Mutatis rerum notis etiam res amissæ sunt.*"—*Prolog. Epist. ad Rom.*, app. iii. 887, 888. Has the Church gained nothing by recovering the dogma?

The remedy is not that the preacher should reject the dogma, but that he should maintain it and master upon it, until he absorbs it, or rather becomes absorbed by it. Then, as he teaches it, it will not be naked truth. Is there such a thing as naked moral or spiritual truth? Doctrines, as our Lord profoundly tells us, come forth as the product of the whole nature of the teacher, true or false, their *fruits*. "Beware of false prophets. . . . Ye shall know them by their *fruits*."—(St. Matthew v. 15, 16.) He whose soul is full of Christ will give life to the dogma by referring it to the living Lord. "Martha said, I know that He shall rise again in the resurrection, in the last day." The Great Teacher does not supersede the dogma which Martha held. He quickens, transfigures it, by linking it to Himself. "Jesus said unto her, I am the Resurrection and the Life."—(St. John xi. 24, 25.) Because the preacher is possessed by the dogma, he will translate it again and again into varied forms. The form may not be so fine as that of the preachers of other times and other places, but it will be better for him to use, just because it is his own. He will not use a mystic algebra, the frigid language of inanimate speculation. He will not draw the thin intellectual outlines of deep and personal truths. What if he cannot be eloquent? Genius is the rarest gift of God, and eloquence is the rarest form of genius. Yet he will not fail to please: for clear statement is always pleasant, and there is something like a chemical affinity between the Gospel rightly declared and some elements of our nature. He will not fail to be popular. Not in that style of popular preaching which is patronisingly adapted to the assumed tastes of the humbler classes of society,—and which they dislike perhaps more than their betters,—but in that style which addresses itself to those wants and feelings which are most human and universal. In those cases where something like genius meets these moral conditions, a quickened sensibility will detect a thousand lines of association between the dogma and other truths, a thousand avenues between it and the nature of man, between it and the thoughts that stir the pulses of his age. And at times the doctrine which before was like a bare peak, weather-stained by time and seamed by controversy, will stand out bathed in the light of heaven from above, and chequered by the tenderest shadows of the human heart from beneath. If "many of our terms"—to use the language of one of our greatest preachers, speaking on a kindred subject at Norwich last year—"have survived their first fervid meaning, and have out-lived the reality of their work," it proves to us that "our theology, even though created by the Divine Word, and breathed upon by the Almighty Spirit, needs to touch anew the

mother-soil of the human heart, that it may spring up invigorated for the battles of the Lord.”¹

Another form of *traditionalism* consists in accepting and repeating stock proofs of dogmatic truths. It is absolutely demanded from us at the present time that the Scripture proofs which we offer should be weighed, not counted. It is frequently said in the anti-dogmatic interest, that the interpretation of Scripture is receiving another character from modern criticism. But the dogmas and distinctions of theology are, it is alleged, based upon exploded interpretations. Therefore, the dogmas must disappear with the proofs.² But the subtraction of an individual proof—passage does not of itself form the slightest presumption against a current dogma. The proof offered is logically lessened only by the disqualified text. It is exactly what it was before, *minus* the passage subtracted from it. On the other hand, canonical proof, which still holds its own, imparts peculiar security to a doctrine,³ and all the great dogmas of the faith are defended by so many texts that they can afford to dispense with any one text which criticism can fairly invalidate.⁴ The frequent interpolations made during the early controversies in the orthodox interest have not served its cause. That cause is too strong to need, too sacred to permit, one untrue or questionable argument. The preacher should be conscientiously on his guard against straining the moral into the dogmatic. He may only too probably excite a prejudice against the dogma. Thus the text, “He that raiseth up Christ from the dead shall quicken your mortal bodies by His Spirit that dwelleth in you,” has been constantly offered as a dogmatic proof of the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, from the greatness of the work supposed to be assigned to Him as the complete cause of the Resurrection. But there are two fatal objections to this. To make the Holy Spirit such an instrumental cause, a reading which cannot be maintained must be adopted.⁵ And the whole context shows that the Apostle does not intend to teach us by what means God will do His resurrection-work; but what we are to do that God’s resurrection-work may be wrought in us. Every brick in the fabric of proof should be rung before it is laid.

2. A second danger is *ultra-dogmatism*—the spirit which brings a preacher into the pulpit with a few formulas, within whose narrow rim he proposes to end all the mysteries of God’s kingdom. I need only quote Bacon’s words—“In divinity many things must be left abrupt, not round and uniform, and concluded with this—*O altitudo*.”

3. A third danger is *pseudo-dogmatism*. Never let us handle dogmatically any proposition which is not dogma. Are we sure that it is true. Is it read in Scripture, which contains sufficiently all

(1) *Preaching; its Adaptation to the Present Time*. By the Dean of Canterbury.—Report of Norwich Church Congress, p. 214.

(2) Professor Jowett’s argument in *Essays and Reviews*, p. 421.

(3) Schleiermacher, *Outlines*, p. 168.

(4) Thus, whatever becomes of 1 Timothy iii. 16, John i. 1, remains. The old interpolation of the Holy Spirit’s name in 1 Cor. viii. 6, to give a proof of the Trinity can be fearlessly admitted; or that of the passage 1 John v. 7, while ii. Cor. xiii. ult. Matt. xxviii. 19, remain unsuspected.—See Reiche, *Comment. Criticus in N. T.*, p. 66.

(5) Romans viii. 11. The reading of Tischendorf and Lachmann is διὰ τὸ ἐννοῦν αὐτὸν πνεῦμα ἐν ὑμῖν, not διὰ τοῦ κ. τ. λ.

doctrine required of necessity for eternal salvation? May it be proved thereby? is it a doctrine of our own Church? I will venture to say that in regard to the atonement of our Lord, the inspiration of Holy Scripture, the eternity of future punishment, current prejudices and objections are much more against certain pseudo-dogmas, supposed to be identical with them, than against the dogmas themselves. It is the operation of these two principles which has been at work in the developments of Rome, until she seems to have buried herself in a theological cocoon of her own spinning.

4. Another danger incident to dogmatic teaching from the pulpit is *disproportion*. To the partial eye of the mere systematic or doctrinal preacher, an optical illusion takes place. Predestination, or assurance, with one school,—Holy Baptism with another,—is everything and everywhere. He forgets that we may err by wrong proportion as much as by wrong statement. Against this the preacher has two safeguards. One is the balance supplied by the Church's services, and the full-orbed cycle of her annual commemorations. Another is the test which is supplied to an impartial mind by the relative mass and variety of Scriptural statement, and by the bearings of the dogma upon salvation and practical believers. Take such dogmas as these: the Holy Trinity;—the structure of whole books of the Bible is Trinitarian. The Divinity of our Lord is not merely written in two or three dozen of scattered texts; one vast shape towers up to the full height of the canvas;—the very space which He fills proves that He is Divine. The Atonement is not dependent upon one isolated figure, or the nice interpretation of a preposition; the cross is not stamped upon this or that pinnacle;—the whole cathedral of God's Word is Cruciform. These, and such as these, are the great proto-dogmatic subjects. On these the salvation of sinners depends. Of these when we speak we want not confidence or witness. The whole Church echoes our words. The great deep of Scripture is behind us with many voices. Some of us complain—and not without reason—that our dogmatic teaching upon the Sacraments (for a dogmatic statement it is that they are *efficacia signa*, signs effective of the grace which they signify) meets with a slow and suspicious acceptance. May it not be that we sometimes place them in wrong perspective? say nothing wrong perhaps, but the right thing in wrong proportion; put the first second, and the second first; and thus to jealous eyes seems, however unjustly, to overshadow the Lord of the Sacraments by His own most blessed ordinances? It would save us much controversy, and preaching to no practical purpose, if we remembered that the primary and generative propositions of dogmas should be our subjects for the pulpit, and not remote or subtle deductions from them. Thus the debate on the *Filioque* is not a mere scholastic subtlety. Yet the mistake is not a fundamental one. Salvation only requires us to believe that the Holy Ghost is God, without defining the manner of His procession. In the Nicene Creed all competent theologians assert a certain subordination of the Son to the Father, implied in the *ἐνα Θεόν* and *Θεόν ἐκ Θ.* (Bull, *Def. F. N.*, i., 16). Yet from most preachers the first dogma would sound unintelligible, and the second heretical. The spread of historical

and critical studies, with all their advantages, has brought into our pulpits a danger of *disproportion* of a different kind. There are two elements in the Bible. It reveals verities that human reason could never have discovered. It gives us these eternal dogmas clothed round with a whole contexture of circumstances. The work of the historian and critic is with the latter, the work of the theologian and preacher with the former. The preacher, indeed may borrow profitably and largely from the other. He is permitted to paint, as well as to touch and teach. His language, said the old Homiletic teachers, should be *concreta* and *scenica*, a constant *deductio intellectualis ad sensibile*. Yet unless the critical and historical be sternly subordinated to the eternal truth with which the preacher is charged, his message may be smothered in sand, or lost in coloured mists. He should give his hearers the *results* in plain language, not the *process*. Can it be denied that our preaching has become, in some quarters of the Antiquarian, in others of the Colourist school? Imagination is not faith.¹ Our object is not to paint scenes, but with hearts quickened and life touched by the eternal Spirit, so to teach that we may be understood by the souls listening to us, some guilty, some tempted, some yearning after holiness, all destined to stand before the judgment-seat of Christ, all wanting in their weakness and weariness the everlasting arms around them, and their feet planted somewhere beyond the waves of time.

5. By some it will be thought that the great danger of dogmatic teaching is its being unpractical. Except for the sake of distinction, comparison between the dogmatic and practical is to be avoided. The Gospel in its entirety is God's way for the renovation of the fallen soul. If we would effect the renovation—whenever we preach we should have this golden rule in our mind, "*necesse est ut aliquid doceas.*" We must take the remedy as a whole. I have no right to say that I aim at a moral end, and will therefore use only what seems to me the purely moral, eliminating what I hold to be the purely dogmatic portions of the revelation. The bearing, indeed, even of apparently abstract dogma like that of the Trinity, upon the Christian life, practical and spiritual, has often been exhibited.²

Yet what if there are Divine lines of connection between parts of the revelation and the will of man which I cannot trace? What if there are lines, interlacing dogma with duty, too subtle for my eyes to follow? I have to aim at producing a certain effect, and I must use the whole appointed apparatus, not an arbitrary selection from it. There are *credenda* as well as *agenda*. Apostolic practice must be founded on apostolic faith. A simple man, a farm-servant in a country parish, expressed this well. When invited to join some sect, upon the plea that it had no creeds, he replied "Never! If you have no creed this year, you will have no commandments next year." Of Christian morality there are two great characteristics. It is *authoritative*. It comes to the dullest hearer not as a specula-

(1) See Dr. Goulburn's paper on Dogmatic Theology in the *Churchman's Family Magazine* for January, 1866.

(2) Thus Waterland shows of the doctrine of the Trinity that it directs and determines worship, and that it influences practice, by forming proper dispositions, strengthening Gospel motives, enforcing the doctrines of the Lord's atonement, and of spiritual grace.—(*Importance of the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity Asserted.*)

tion but as a voice from the oracle of God and those clouds that encompass His presence. It is *pervasive*. It is not partial and successive in its effects. It is not like the sculptor who can work upon only one portion of his statue at a time; it is like nature, at work in every portion of the plant at once, with a simultaneous operation. Christianity, turned into a morality without dogma, a popular commentary upon the law of duty, loses these characteristics. Dogmatic poverty starves moral teaching. Let us suppose, for instance, a preacher taking advantage of the Epistle for last Sunday to speak of "corrupt communication." No subject might well seem to be less linked with dogma. Yet unless the preacher be possessed with the idea of the Personality of the Holy Spirit, he cannot use with his people the very argument of St. Paul, "And grieve not the Holy Spirit."¹ So it is round the whole circle of duty. So it is all along the history of the Church. Abrogation of dogma in the supposed interest of morality has always ended in the abrogation of morality. A free handling of dogma in any age has always ended in a very free and easy handling of the moral law. Like the serpent, whose sting is followed after a season by paralysis setting in from the opposite side to that upon which it has been inflicted, the anti-dogmatic spirit strikes Christianity upon the speculative side, but death sets in from the moral side. Had the Saviour only taught "earthly things," not "heavenly things,"² He would have been but a greater Socrates, not the Saviour of the world. Had the Gospel been a morality without a dogma, it would have gone the way of other moralities. There is one thing weaker than a religion without a morality, and that is a morality without a religion.

We should hold Bishop Taylor's advice to be good and sound, "Do not spend your sermon in general and indefinite things, . . . but tell them in every duty, what are the measures, what circumstances, what instruments, and what is the particular minute meaning of every general advice." But we should balance it by the good old rule to teach practice doctrinally and doctrine practically.

6. The due discharge of this important function points to a higher education in theology than seems to be given in any but the Irish University. But I must pause here. The sum of what has been said is this. Dogmatic teaching is required from us; directly and professedly upon the great festivals, and in occasional expositions of Church symbols and formularies. In an indirect shape it can never safely be absent from our teaching, because it supplies those great ideas which lie at the root of all Scripture. We must guard diligently against *traditionalism* whether in statement or proof; against the exaggerations of *ultra-dogmatism*, the usurpation of *pseudo-dogmatism*, the disproportions of narrow systematism, intrusive scholarship, ambitious prettiness. We must trace out as far as we can the connecting links between dogmatic truth and practical religion, and believe that they exist even when we cannot perhaps trace them. It is no light task which we must propose to ourselves in aiming at these two things. First, to preserve the old thoughts in the old

(1) Ephesians iv. 29, 30. See Remains of Mr. Alexander Knox, III. 422.

(2) St. John iii. 12.

words : secondly, to unfold, apply, interpret them—to interpret them so that educated intellect shall perceive the points of junction between them and other truths which God has reserved for us—to interpret them so that even to the peasant's ear the great words uttered of old shall sound as if spoken in his own tongue, in a dialect of earth, answering word for word to the dialect of heaven—that the mist and smoke of half understood definitions shall drift away, and show him bright lines of everlasting truth slanting down from the throne of God direct to his own heart. It is no light task. The words are living words : but we must bring living hearts to them. The Holy Ghost, who called us to the ministry, Whom we received at our ordination, is the Lord and Life-giver.

THE REV. CANON JONES READ THE FOLLOWING PAPER BY THE REV.
PROFESSOR SHIRLEY, D.D.

THE office of Christian preaching would seem to be not so much to attract and to inform, as to produce a change of heart in those who are indifferent to religion, and to sustain and strengthen in those who are *not* the power of the spiritual life. All communication of knowledge, therefore, from the pulpit, whether it be historical, moral, or doctrinal, is simply a means to a given end. The question before us is how this end is best to be attained ?

It is clear, moreover, that preaching—proposing to itself such an end as this—must appeal to motives of no common order ; and that the higher the motives which it can effectually bring to bear upon the heart of man, the greater is the hope of any true success.

Thus much, perhaps, will be admitted on all hands. The moment, however, we come to consider what are the highest motives which are recognized by the heart of man, we receive, in substance, one of two answers, upon which are based two opposite schools of preaching, which are as contradictory in their whole conception and course as they are in their answer to this fundamental question.

The one school makes its highest appeal to the sense which exists within man of the good, the beautiful, and the true ; the other places foremost the prostrate misery of his nature in the presence of the over-mastering power of evil, and the inextinguishable yearning for a help which is above and beyond his own.

The one attempts, in short, to raise man by an appeal to his strength, the other by an appeal to his weakness. The first of these, which appeals to the love of what is good, and beautiful, and true, holds these motives to have been rectified in man by the influence of the work of Christ, and that being so rectified and elevated through Him, they now form a basis of noble and heavenward aspiration, to which the preacher may safely appeal as a motive, and which has the merit of being as universal as it is noble ; for it comes home, in its degree, to every one, whatever his previous teaching or form of belief may have been. Christianity, as so presented, is in short synonymous with moral goodness. It is a Christianity, therefore, of the largest toleration, for it recognizes as a part of itself, whatever is good and pure, and true, not only without distinction of sect or church, but

even beyond the very pale of Christendom. There are, of course, shades of difference which come under this general conception of the office of preaching. For the highest moral goodness one will substitute the harmonious developement of humanity;—another will appeal to the beautiful more directly than to the true, and set before himself æsthetic beauty as the basis of his religious appeal to the heart;—a third will seem almost to identify religion with manliness. But whatever these minor variations, the general theory is the same, that the highest evidence for religion lies in the witness of the heart, and its correspondence with our conceptions of what is noble and good and true,—and, as an inference from this, that the appeal to those conceptions is the most effective mode of preaching it.

But this kind of preaching, or rather the idea of religion which underlies it, and of which it is the natural expression, is open to this fundamental objection. It is entirely one-sided in its estimate of that humanity which it aspires to influence so profoundly. It rests on a denial of the nature and depth of sin: and it implies that the whole result of Christianity upon the present life of man consists in a certain elevation of his moral standard, which is directly traceable to the peerless teaching and the spotless example of Our Lord. It amounts therefore to a denial of the gift of a personal and indwelling Spirit, and of the perpetual intercession of Christ. It even goes far to undermine belief in His Divinity and Atoning Sacrifice, for ignoring as it does our individual need of a Saviour, it leaves no intelligible motive for so stupendous a work. It reduces sacraments to a symbol, and miracle to one vast enigma,—one long and unmeaning interference with the course of natural law. If this, we may well say, is the sum of Christianity, then Christ has died in vain. By whatever name it may be called, in whatever communion it may take refuge, such preaching is in principle, and in its certain issue, Socinian.

If it should seem that even this brief mention of such a school of preaching is out of place here, I might answer, I fear, that such preaching is unhappily current, and that it exercises a secret influence upon many who emphatically repudiate its principles. But, in fact, without it I should have found it hard to state, with any clearness, the questions which appear to me to be at issue, among really orthodox Christians, on the subject of dogmatic preaching.

In strong contrast, then, with this school, which is undogmatic in its preaching, because it is anti-dogmatic in its belief, is that which starts, as a first principle, from the sinfulness of man and his consequent need of a Saviour.

The preaching of this school must always be in a certain sense and to a certain degree, dogmatic. The very mention of a Saviour,—of One who not only taught an unequalled morality and left an unapproachable example, but who Redeemed us, and bought us with the price of his blood,—compels questions as to the nature of His work and of His relation to us which are essentially dogmatic. If we start, for instance, from the point on which St. Paul takes his stand, as essential to Christian preaching, the resurrection of our Lord, and follow it out even in the most meagre way, it will be seen that the fact of the resurrection leads to inquiry as to the power in virtue of which it was possible, and from which it derives its significance. It implies,

therefore, almost immediately, as we look backwards, the doctrines of Christ's Sacrifice and Incarnation—and as we look forwards, it can hardly dwell upon the mind without suggesting the Eternal Session at the right hand of the Father, the mission of the Comforter, and the final return to Judgment. If, then, we accept this position we must admit that Dogma lies at the root of all Christian preaching. But if so, the question of dogmatic preaching is, in fact, narrowed to this:—Whether it is more desirable in the pulpit to express doctrine distinctly,—to enlarge on it, illustrate it, appeal to it constantly as a practical motive to action, use it, in short, as the great staple of our preaching:—or on the other hand, to preach habitually the necessity of that holy life which Christ's coming has alone made possible, without dwelling in detail upon the means through which it has so come to be possible;—in other words, to imply doctrine, rather than to express it.

The moment, however, the question is reduced within such limits as these, it becomes to some extent a question of more or less,—of time and place and circumstance,—with which it is very hard to deal in any general form. Whatever, therefore, is said, I must ask you kindly to understand as said with reserve of exceptional cases and positions.

It will enable us, perhaps, to consider better how far an indirect teaching of Christianity is possible, if we set before ourselves a simple picture of what Christianity is. It is a life spent in communion with Christ; we in Him and He in us, He the head and we the members, one with Him by mystical regeneration, and by Sacramental participation in His atoning Sacrifice. It is a life sustained by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, who helps our infirmities and who pleads for us with groanings which cannot be uttered. It is a life watched over by angels, and assisted by the prayers of the Church in earth and heaven. It is a life of conflict against the principalities and the powers of a world of darkness. It is a continual watching against the wiles of the Devil, who is going about, seeking whom he may devour. It is a life, moreover, of hope and of faith; a life whose pilgrimage is here, but whose citizenship is in heaven. It is a life, lastly, of praise and adoration of Him who has created us, of Him who has redeemed us, of Him who sustains us and loves us with an everlasting love. It is a life, in short, in which at every turn the deepest spring of action is a supernatural fact. We preach the necessity of a life which nothing but a supernatural power can maintain, and to which, for the most part, nothing but the hope of heaven and the fear of hell can stimulate the dull and hardened heart. How is it possible, I would ask, to preach such a life, without a continual appeal to the doctrines upon which this life is to be built? How is it possible to preach Christ, without keeping clearly and continually before men who Christ is, what He has done, what He is doing now, what He will do hereafter—or without showing clearly the nature of the Christian conflict, and of the depth of that corruption which penetrates even to the world of spirits?

But it will be answered, perhaps—You mistake the question at issue. You have used dogma, doctrine, supernatural fact, as if they were synonymous. Whereas, what is really objected to, by those who complain of dogmatic preaching, is not the appeal to supernatural

facts in preaching, nor even to theological doctrine, as found in the pages of the New Testament; but the insisting upon dogma, in the strict sense of the word,—the statements of Creeds, and the decrees of Councils, with all their rigid inflexibility, their absence of human sympathy, and their striking contrast to the whole manner and tone of Apostolic teaching.

If so, however, the question is still further narrowed. It is admitted, if so, not only that doctrine lies at the root of all Christian preaching, but that all preaching must express and appeal to the supernatural facts and doctrines which the New Testament reveals, and which are acknowledged to be the springs of the Christian life. Would God, that thus much were admitted, loyally and frankly, in every English pulpit! It still remains, in this view of the subject, to be considered, what is the best mode of presenting doctrine from the pulpit;—a question far narrower indeed than that with which we have begun this paper, but yet, perhaps, of deeper interest to the mass of those here present.

The contrast which undoubtedly exists between the theology of Creeds and Councils and that of the New Testament is variously regarded as consisting

I. In a substantive difference as to the doctrine received :

II. In the mode of conceiving doctrine, and the form of expressing it.

As an instance of the first may be mentioned the old accusation brought against what is called the Nicene doctrine of the Trinity, as not to be found in the Bible. The discussion of a point like this is obviously beyond our present reach and passes altogether into another field of controversy. I mention it only because I think that in some minds the objection to Creeds is not faithfully analysed, and that the objection which is urged against the form is in reality inspired by a dislike of the substance.

II. The second objection, that the mode in which Creeds and Councils conceive and express doctrine is different from that of the New Testament and inferior to it, is one which deserves a full and careful examination. The mode in which Creeds and Councils conceive and express doctrine is Dogma. The objection amounts, in fact, to saying that Doctrine, not Dogma, is the true subject matter of Christian preaching. Let us examine the terms. By *dogma* (as the word is used by modern writers) I understand broadly an authoritative decree, such as were the commands of the Mosaic Law, τὸν νόμον τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασι (Eph. II. 15); or the decrees of the Council of Jerusalem. As limited by custom to a special subject matter, it comes to mean Doctrine as defined by authoritative decree of the Church. Doctrine and Dogma are identical, therefore, as to their subject, although not coincident in extent, for there is much doctrine which has not become the subject of dogma. Dogmas are, in short, to quote the words of the late Dr. Baur of Tübingen, “the doctrines of the Christian faith, so far as they are expressed in propositions, in which they exhibit, as far as possible, their defined form of church teaching. It is impossible, for instance, to speak of the dogma of the Trinity, without at the same time thinking of a defined form of that doctrine.” I have quoted these

words from a quarter not to be suspected of a leaning towards church teaching, because they are a definition of dogma, and something more. They express shortly what dogma is, and how it arose. It arose, in fact, from that necessity of definition, which every branch of human knowledge experiences, and from which the highest is not and cannot be exempt. To infer that theological definition is useless, because the New Testament does not teach by definitions, is like arguing that there can be no value in a grammar because none was written by Thucydides or by Cicero. It is not the creative Spirit but the learner who needs the aid of definition. But in theological as in every other science, more exact definition implies an increase of knowledge. Doubtless, for instance, the earliest Christians, though they held implicitly the doctrine of the Trinity, did not realize, as fully as those who penned the Creed of Nicæa, all that was involved in that great cardinal doctrine. It was by conflict, by discussion, by the necessity of repelling false inferences from the words of Scripture or of the Church, that a more exact definition was at length arrived at. And that exactness of definition, in this as in other cases, is not merely an intellectual acquisition, it is a distinct spiritual gain. It is for us in its own department, what in another is a richer liturgy or a more spiritual hymnal. It points our devotion with a clearer aim. It enlarges our thoughts of God; it invests Him in our hearts with a fuller and more perfect personality.

The main use, then, of Dogma, or theological definition, is threefold:—

1. As a protection to the Church against the encroachment of heresy.
2. As a guide to the theological student.
3. As a religious benefit to the people.

With the first of these uses we have nothing here to do, and with the second only so far as it is intimately connected with the third. But it may be observed, that language is often used, which is calculated to disparage, without exactly denying, the value of dogma, as a guide at least to a preacher. It is suggested that the pulpit has lost much by the substitution of rigorously defined teaching for the spirit-stirring appeals of St. Paul, or the simplicity of the Gospel exhortation. As if the great difference between the teaching of St. Paul and our own consisted in his neglect and our employment of exact theological language; or as if it were to be expected that if we would only burn our Creeds, and study unfettered the letters of the Apostles and the personal teaching of Our Lord, the fervour of Apostolic preaching would return, and the glories of the early Church would revive.

This language is, in fact, compounded of a very obvious truth, and a very glaring mis-statement. If it is meant that spirit-stirring appeals and simple exhortations are more suitable to the pulpit than the terms of an exact theology, the truth of the remark is obvious; but it is (as we shall see more fully presently) in no way inconsistent with strictly dogmatic teaching.

If it is meant that such appeals and exhortations cannot be produced by men whose minds are imbued with exact theological thought, and that one secret of St. Paul's fervour is the absence from his own mind of exact theological conception,—I venture to

think that the meaning is one which to express clearly is to answer. An exact theologian may indeed not be a fervid or effective preacher, but assuredly, in that case, he would not become one if he could be made to forget his theology.

3. By the use of dogmatic statement for the general religious benefit of the people, is meant, for our present purpose, the use of it by the preacher, not for his personal guidance, but for the instruction of those whom he addresses.

And this is the part of our subject which requires the closest and most careful attention. For here in fact is presented to us the question of dogmatic preaching, in that ultimate form in which it may fairly admit of very different answers from men who are equally alive to the value of exact doctrine. Let us, before we proceed, recapitulate the results at which we have arrived. We have seen

i. That the teaching of positive doctrine is of the very essence of Christian preaching.

ii. That it is impossible to teach this doctrine merely in its effects on the life: it cannot be merely implied, it must be expressed.

iii. That doctrine entails Dogma in the inevitable progress of things.

iv. That Dogma or defined doctrine is not merely inevitable, but valuable, at least to the student of theology.

It remains to be considered whether it is equally valuable to the Christian community at large: and if so, in what manner, and under what conditions, it is best imparted to them. It is especially to be observed while we do so, that, as we have seen, supernatural facts lie at the very basis of Christianity, that these must be taught to every Christian congregation, and that on these, and not upon vague emotion, is to be built our appeal to the hearts and consciences of men. Now it must be confessed that this being the case, the first presumption is in favour of exact dogmatic teaching. The whole analogy of all secular learning is in its favour. Everywhere the value is acknowledged of exact definition, and of clear summaries of the leading principles of the subject, as the best and surest guide to the beginner, as the stay and the corrector of the master. No reason would appear why it should be otherwise in theology; and it is I think well worthy of consideration how far the safety with which we place the Bible in the hands of our people, may not depend on their perfect familiarity with the Creed, acting as an ever-present interpreter, and giving cohesion and unity to the teaching of the Sacred Volume.

Another argument may be derived from the way in which, as a matter of history, dogmatic statements have arisen. They are an answer to the searching questions which human thought has put to the propounders of Christian doctrine. When these searching questions cease, then perhaps, but not till then, can Christian doctrine be expounded in an undogmatic form. As it is, they must be taught in the face of an enquiring world, and a world which has learnt by long usage to attach a particular meaning to the use, or to the absence, of certain theological statements. We cannot revoke the past, or will into nothing the history of eighteen centuries.

It will, indeed, be freely admitted by many that the theory of dogmatic teaching is excellent, but that in practice it is open to such serious objections as in fact to involve its failure.

The chief of these admit, I believe, of being summed under three heads:—

1. That it is negative, barren, and unprofitable.
2. That it is essentially a teaching at second hand, which involves a fatal loss of power.
3. That it tends to sow and perpetuate differences.

The two first of these objections have so far common ground that they both suggest the question, whether they apply to all dogmatic preaching, or only to particular forms of it—whether, in short, they are of force against such preaching altogether, or only as pointing out certain faults, or corruption, to which it is especially liable.

1. For example, to take the first. When people complain that Dogma may inform the head but cannot warm the heart, or when they say that the natural effect of dogmatic preaching upon the mind is to lead it to think of faith as consisting in the rejection of error, they are mentally identifying dogmatic preaching with controversy. But controversy is not dogma. It is the aspect indeed which dogma presents to its enemies: but to its disciples it wears a far different face. It is, of all things, the most positive and practical. It is instinct with joyous thoughts, and the springs of a holy life.

2. To the second objection, that dogmatic preaching is essentially a second hand preaching, I should have been glad, had time permitted, to give a fuller consideration. By the objection is meant that the sure tendency of such preaching is to throw the preacher upon the study of systems of theology, rather than upon the study of the Bible on one side, and of human character on the other.

It is an objection, let me say it frankly, full of weight and importance. The general reply to it is, as I have strongly hinted, that this tendency is not of the essence of such preaching, it is only an accident and corruption of it. The profoundest theologians have known the best, how true it is that *pectus facit theologum*, and that their inspiration must be sought on their knees, from the very Fountain head of truth. All human theology is at the best but a guide to the study of the Bible. But the danger of losing sight of this is a real and, I am persuaded, a present one. Let me instance a single case. We are contending earnestly for the doctrine of the true Divinity of Our Lord, as the one upon which, perhaps, more than on any other, the controversies of our day depend. We throw, in our eagerness, into the background his equally true Humanity. Then there appears a work, like the well-known *Ecce Homo*, giving a one-sided and often painful, but vivid, portraiture of the Lord's human life, and it produces an impression far beyond anything which its merits would appear to warrant. The truth is that it thrills to the heart with the power of a forgotten truth, and carries a rebuke to us and to our one-sided preaching. It is but one warning in ten thousand, ever sending back theologians to those sacred pages, where truth exhibits herself in seeming contradiction, but without a shade of compromise; and exhibits herself, too, as the parent of holy works, and as the guide of the soul to the presence and throne of its God. In the study of Holy Scripture, and in the mastery of Scriptural Exegesis, we ought to be, as a Church, in the very vanguard of Christendom. So long as it is otherwise—and how far otherwise it is we must con-

fess with shame and sorrow—so long we must offer serious cautions as to the use of a more dogmatic preaching. For until this is attained our preaching, however unexceptionable in doctrine, will be wanting in warmth, and love, and power, and in that true Catholicity of tone which no orthodoxy can ensure. Let us hope and pray that no half-hearted timidity,—no unwillingness to own what scriptural interpretation owes to those whose defective faith we lament,—may be permitted to dwarf or retard among us the revival of a profounder study of the Bible. If this, under God's good pleasure, should go hand in hand with the restoration of dogmatic preaching, it may be the instrument in his hands of giving to the Church of England a depth of spiritual life not unequal to the struggle which assuredly lies before her.

3. To the last charge, that dogmatic preaching tends to sow and to perpetuate differences, I own that I am not very careful to answer. There are those, I know, who offer us a millennial repose on the broad basis of the answer of Pilate to Christ. Let truth be an open question, and all the world will be agreed. *Solitudinem faciunt, pacem appellant.* Better than such a peace the keenest and most enduring hostility! Yet I know of one Society in which that peace has actually been attained for which these dreamers long. In that Society, the loving harmony of which extorted the reluctant praise of her enemies, and which bowed to her gentle sway the civilization of the ancient world,—in the Church of the first three centuries,—there were Liturgies whose strong dogmatic tones our people would not endure, there was a Discipline based upon doctrines which are now openly derided, there was a Ritual which even in persecution was full of majesty and significance. And this was the Church which has of all human societies the most nearly approached to the ideal of peace among men. Eden, not the desert, is the true land of peace.

WALTER W. SHIRLEY.

N.B.—The sickness which prevented the lamented Professor from attending the Congress terminated in death on the 21st of November, 1866. In this Paper, therefore, as in the Bishop of Calcutta's, the Press has been corrected by the Editor.

DISCUSSION.

THE DEAN OF CORK: After what you have heard with such manifest delight from my friend the Dean of Emly as to the duty of dogmatic teaching by the Church, I think I may safely assume that your opinion is that the Church should give dogmatic teaching from the pulpit. I am not about to add a word to what he has said, but I wish to draw your attention to one fact, namely, that dogmatic preaching is, in certain quarters, largely unpopular. It is a fact, and a very important one, that dogmatic teaching is at present largely unpopular, and that it is specially unpopular exactly with that class on which we wish our pulpit teaching specially to tell—the liberally educated and thinking classes. It is impossible to converse with such men, or to read the popular literature that reflects their minds, and not be struck with their increasing impatience of what they call dogmatism in the pulpit. There is nothing they resent and disapprove of more than the assertion by the preacher of distinctive, essential truth. The model sermon, in their eyes, is that which contains the least amount of religious doctrine with the largest amount of religious sentiment—a sermon all colour and no form. They like to lose their way in company with the preacher in a sort of

warm haze of vague religious thought, and to hear him assure them that out of this mist he has neither the mission nor the power to guide them. Any thing more than this—any attempt to mark before them a clear path hedged in by boundaries of definite truth, and to say, "This is the way, walk ye in it," they resent as an impertinence. It is presumption—it is dogmatism. Now, I say this unpopularity of dogmatic teaching is a very serious fact; not because unpopularity is in itself a very serious evil: it is not the mission of the Church to please the age, but to instruct and to reform, and therefore, if need be, to rebuke and displease the age. It might be well for us to remember this. It might be well if we were to reply occasionally to the writers in magazines and newspapers who are so kindly anxious to teach us how to be popular, that there are worse faults than unpopularity in a preacher. It might be well for us if we had more of the stern spirit of the prophet who will cry aloud whether men hear or forbear, and less of the spirit of the performer, who is miserable if he has not a full house, and an applauding critique in the next day's newspaper. Nevertheless this unpopularity of dogma is a serious and important fact, for another and very different reason. If it is not the duty of the Church to please the age, it is her duty to understand the age. If she should never slavishly defer to the wishes of the age, she should ever seek to interpret them—ever seek to find out what is that real need of which they are the unconscious expression. So that she may give the age, not what it wishes, but what it wants—may give it bread though it asks a stone! In this point of view any collision between the duty of the Church and the taste of the age is of very serious significance. It indicates always a want in the age, often a defect in the Church. It suggests always these two questions:—1. What is it that the age really needs in this matter? and, 2. How far is the Church supplying that need? Let us consider this fact in this light. And, firstly, I observe the dislike of dogmatic teaching is really a dislike of dogma itself, a dislike of it quite as much in our creeds as in our pulpits. Indeed, to allow of dogma and forbid dogmatic teaching is absurd. There can be no teaching without some dogma. Dogma—*i. e.*, accepted and fixed truth—is the ground of all precept, and it is the reason for all sentiment. Precept is only dogma in the imperative form. "Thou shalt not steal" is only another form of the dogma "it is a wrong thing to steal," and that again resolves itself into dogma as to the grounds of moral obligation. "I love God" is the expression of a sentiment. But the reason for that sentiment is the dogma, "God is love. God loves me." Nay, the very words of our worship, God and Christ, are only concentrated dogmas. Dogma is the one essential part of all teaching. To expect teaching without dogma is just as reasonable as to expect language without grammar, or argument without logic. You may have bad grammar, or bad logic, or bad dogma in a sermon,—and I am afraid you sometimes have all three,—but grammar, and logic, and dogma of some kind or other you must have in every sermon. The dislike for dogmatic teaching being therefore really a dislike for dogma itself, and a wish to have as little of it as possible, we have next to ask, what are the causes of this dislike? I believe they are to be found partly in the spirit of the age; partly in the faults of the Church; partly in the nature of dogma itself. One cause is the scientific spirit of the age. Science is essentially undogmatic;—not that scientific men are not often intensely and unpleasantly dogmatic, but that the spirit of science is opposed to dogma. The man of science holds his firmest convictions only as deductions from the facts he knows. He is prepared at any moment to modify them on the discovery of new facts. The spirit of science is that of progress: it knows of no finality of belief. Now, to this the spirit of theology is essentially opposed. Theology discovers no new facts; it neither adds to nor takes from the deposit of truths which it has possessed from the first. Science discovers facts and constructs hypotheses. Faith receives revelations, accepts and clings to creeds. Science rejects authority, faith rests on it. This is one reason, I think, why a highly scientific age resents the attempt to impose upon it a fixed creed, to which nothing can be added, and from which nothing can be taken away. It cannot endure finality in belief. It demands progress in religious science as in all other. It will not endure to hear a teacher propound doctrines, as eternally, unchangeably true; not as hypotheses or opinions, which better knowledge may modify; still less to hear him rest them on authority and on that alone. Here, then, we see a great need of the age. The assertion of the objective truth of revelation, the proclamation by the Church of the existence of a supernatural world, over against the natural world, the assertion of spiritual truths and facts that rest upon authority in the midst of an age which believes only in physical truths and facts that rest on demonstration; a refusal by men of faith to allow science to intrude into the domain of faith, as resolute as the refusal by men of science to allow faith to intrude into the

domain of science. Another cause for the dislike of dogma is the revolutionary character of modern thought. We have got from spiritual despotism in the past to a perfect lawlessness and license of thought in the present. Men have passed from the extreme of believing it right to burn men for opinions, to the extreme of believing there are no opinions worth having or being burned for. They have passed from the assertion that thought should be *free*—i.e., free from all penalty inflicted by men, to the idea that all thought is *irresponsible*—i.e., free from every consequence appointed by God. That is, they have come to a theory that man is not responsible for his belief. This is, of course, directly opposed to the idea of religious dogma, which is, in part at least, not only truth, but necessary truth—truth which a man is answerable for rejecting; truth which to know is life, and to refuse to know is death. Here, again, is a great need of the age, which the teaching of dogma from the pulpit is meant to reach—the need to have brought before it the responsibility—the duty—of belief. The need that the Church should maintain from her pulpit, not with bitterness, but with loving distinctness, the message she has received—"He that believeth shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned." But there is a cause for dislike of dogmatic teaching in the Church as well as in the age, and that is sectarianism in the Church. It is clear that every sect must be intensely dogmatic. It is for the sake of some distinctive opinion or dogma of its own that it has split off from the Church Catholic. If it does not maintain and defend that dogma, it ceases to exist, it has nothing else to live for or to live by. Accordingly all its teaching is steeped in this dogmatic colour. Its pulpits will always ring the changes on the little set of notions which are its very life. And in like manner within the Church, the peculiar, the distinctive ideas of each school or party will find the most prominent often an exclusive place in their teaching, and they will be presented mostly in a strong, exaggerated, controversial form. Now, the natural result of this is, an utter weariness, to men of liberal mind, of the incessant party strife of the pulpit, incessant wrangling about what seem to them, and often are, small points of doctrine, and a mere iteration of party shibboleths; and they very naturally but very unreasonably lay the blame of their narrow dogmatism upon dogma itself. See, they say, how dogma divides and estranges men. What a gain to religion and the Church, if we could get rid of these points of doctrine, these formularies and articles about which men fight so bitterly! Now, to say this—to blame dogma as the cause of dogmatism, is just as unreasonable as to blame money as the cause of covetousness. Not money, but the love of money, is the root of evil. Not dogma, but the love of dogmatising, is the cause of strife. The true remedy for sectarianism is, not to get rid of dogma, which is just as impossible as getting rid of money, but restoring it to its proper place and use. What we need is really not less dogma, but more of the right kind. We need to substitute the great broad verities of the Christian creed for the small views and opinions of the sects and the schools; the dogmas of the Catholic Church for the dogmas of Messrs. Brown, Jones, and Robinson, which they and their friends pleasantly call the whole Gospel, or the truth. What we need is the merging of the sect and the party in the Church; the merging of the teacher and his views in the faith. Depend upon it, if anything will ever exercise the spirit of small sectarian dogmatism, it will be the preaching of the great dogmas of the Church Catholic. It is in the back streams and eddies of sects and parties that these straws and sticks and froth of private opinion are always whirling round and round. The remedy is not to dry up the stream of truth, but to deepen its channel and strengthen its banks. Do this, and the rush of its waters will soon sweep away these small disfigurements from its surface! Lastly, there is a reason for the unpopularity of dogmatic teaching in the nature of dogma itself. Dogma conveys ideas, *fixed truth*, for which are fixed forms of speech. Now, while the truth is eternally the same, the vehicle which conveys it, language, is constantly changing; not merely because words themselves become obsolete, but because the forms of thought, the philosophy, the metaphysics which have tinged them, change. The more perfectly any idea has clothed itself in the thought and philosophy of any one age, the less likely will it be to be clearly and easily intelligible to the succeeding age. Formularies, therefore, are always in danger of becoming more and more a dead language; in danger of losing the freshness and colour and softened outlines of the living body, and becoming merely the dried mummy or skeleton of truth, and, as such, not only unpopular, but unintelligible to all save the scientific theologian. This is a real danger; but what is the remedy for it? Not certainly in the *alteration* of those ancient formularies into modern phraseology and thought. If this were done, it would only have to be done over again ere long, just because these formularies, so exactly suited to us, would not suit ages that came after us. Our living language would become a dead

one ere long. The remedy lies, not in perpetual alteration of the original, but in perpetual translation; lies in the art of rendering these old and fixed forms into modern thought and language, not in the book but in the pulpit. There there should be a perpetual clothing of the framework of truth with the flesh and colour of modern life and thought and feeling. This is the special office of the pulpit—to mediate between what is in danger of becoming the dead book and the living hearts of the people. Both are indispensable. The *Book* to be the standard of the preacher; the preacher to be the *illustrator* of the Book. The formularies of our Church have been called in scorn petrified forms: I thank them for teaching me that word. They are petrified; and the term rightly represents the solidity, the firmness, the sharp, clear outline of the rock on which rests our faith. But the office of the preacher is to smite the rock, that the living waters it contains shall gush forth to satisfy the thirst of the age. I trust we may have wisdom rightly to discharge our double task—guardians of the rock, dispensers of the stream. If we are thus faithful to our mission, that stream will follow still the Church's pilgrimage, weary and difficult, nay, dangerous even, as that pilgrimage may be. And if in our day cold shadows of doubt, or the darker night of unbelief, should settle down around us, still along the course of those waters, "deepening still their voice with the deepening of the night," shall come to us the voice of the dead past and yet of the living present, the voice of the one unbroken stream of undying Catholic truth.

MR. SIDNEY OWEN: I propose, after glancing at the shortcomings of sermons, to trace them, as far as my limits will allow, to their causes, and to end with the suggestion of what seem appropriate remedies. I must speak plainly, but shall certainly set down naught in malice. If you differ, pause before you condemn. Strike, but hear. It is hardly necessary to enumerate what may be called the specific faults of sermons. I had indeed drawn up a tolerably long list of these. But, on second thoughts, I will ask leave to omit it. I am constrained to say many unpleasant things, and would wish earnestly to avoid every occasion of needless severity, or seeming harshness, which would in fact tend to defeat my humble desire to be useful. There are, however, two general and radical evils which I may not pass over lightly. First, whatever else a sermon may be, it ought to be *formally* a literary composition. I do not mean, of course, that it ought to be *written*. But it should be an argumentative and hortatory discourse, should maintain and develop a definite thesis, be arranged on a distinct and recognizable plan, make out its case (if I may say so) in a regular and consecutive manner, marshalling its facts and its arguments in logical order, and deducing such conclusions, at once practical and important, as are actually involved in the premises of the professed text. But is it uncommon to hear sermons which do not at all answer this description? Are not many such addresses in truth no sermons, properly speaking, at all? And that, because they are not in fact literary compositions at all, but rambling unconnected strings of remarks, good, perhaps even valuable in themselves, but cohering by no strict bond of unity; at best mere *disjecti membra predicatoris*, exhibiting not an organic structure, animated and energising with a convergent life in all its parts, but a chaotic debris—a colluvies of mechanically attached fragments, a sort of conglomerate formation in the world of mind? The other fundamental defect is of a very different, it may almost be said of an opposite character. It is what educated persons often mean when they complain that the sermon is a mere essay: what the uneducated imply when they say that they "get no good" from the discourse. It is that lack of simple earnestness and penetration which ought to accompany the wielding of the "sword of the spirit, to the dividing asunder of joints and marrow;" of that intimate communing of heart with heart which can alone avail to the ends of spiritual teaching; of that searching dissection of the morbid inner nature, that probing into vivid poignancy of the dull sores that had lain perhaps unnoted even by the sufferer; in a word, the exercise of that sublime moral power and spiritual insight which St. Paul displayed when he told of the warfare in his members, and which, culminating in the ineffable majesty and directly divine teaching of Him who knew what was in man, and spake accordingly as never man spake, is yet attainable in measure by such of His faithful followers as seek it aright, and examine and purify their own hearts, so as to render them not altogether unworthy recipients of the heaven sent and apostolic gift. The blame of all this, and of a host of other serious though minor defects that might be noted, must certainly not be laid directly, or in some respects at all, upon the unsuccessful preacher. Here, as elsewhere, widespread evils spring from general causes, though not without human fault too. Of those causes the following appear to be some of the principal. The clergy, but especially the younger clergy, preach far too much, if not far too soon. It is bad for Macaulay's

statesman to be called upon to speak first, and think afterwards. It is bad for once able and vigorous writers to dribble their powers away, and "write themselves out." But if a sermon ought to be the result of a sustained effort of thought, and if thought is always wearing and exhausting, and requires leisure and calmness, is it not yet worse for the clergyman, young and untrained, or in weak health (too common a case), or whose vital powers are decaying, to be, besides all other professional duties, expected to compose and compelled to deliver an unfailling stream of (say) from two to four sermons a week? I touch with hesitation a delicate subject, but am emboldened by the analogy and the experience of secular teaching. The solidarity (in French phrase) of the service and the sermon, the conventional necessity for those who attend the former to remain always as a matter of course during the latter, acts (I am convinced) badly in many ways. As to the congregation, it is not that they do not like sermons at all, but they do not like to be obliged always, and as a matter of course, to sit through any kind of sermon that shall be offered them, after they have already attended the prayers. This may or may not be wrong; but the question for us now is, is it a fact? And if so, or even if the preacher suspects that his lot is to harangue a reluctant audience, has it not a bad effect both upon the composition and the delivery of his sermon? Whoever has taught knows how painful, how deadening it is to teach against the pupils' grain. And who has not felt the obstructive misery of endeavouring to pour counsel into the unwilling ear? Nay, may I frankly own that, at this very crisis, my thoughts hang fire, and my words falter, from a lively fear of being placed in this predicament? Besides the obvious and frequently regretted want of elocutionary discipline, much must undoubtedly be attributed to the very common absence among the clergy, as among the laity, of timely and systematic training in English composition. It is to a great extent ignored at school. At Oxford (and I presume in other Universities) the pass course does not comprise it. And many candidates for honours make very little progress in it. The majority of those ordained from the Universities are passmen; and many are ordained very soon after leaving college, and are occupied in the interval with renewed studies, pursued much after the former fashion. What, again, can a few months at a theological college avail for the purpose I am now contemplating, with a mind, and (as I shall show presently a character) often almost entirely undeveloped, or misdeveloped, and in the small residue of hours devoted to a variety of theological reading? So that, on the whole, it is not too much to assert that the unfortunate curate is often required to write himself out, before he has properly begun (so to speak) to write himself in. Where elementary literary training is so defective, learning and the higher efforts of thought will in vain be looked for. I will not say, with an eminent Professor, that the knowledge represented by a pass is considerably less than nothing. But I will say, that as a qualification for good preaching it is not worth taking into account. And as before I ask again, how far is it, in the majority of cases, supplemented afterwards, either before or after Ordination? But, after all, it is not mere literary skill, or learning, or philosophic acumen, that are required to furnish forth the good preacher, however requisite each in its place, the first in some sort always, the others for threading the deeper mazes of the theological labyrinth. Moral earnestness, serious and intimate conviction, and personal devotion are the root of the matter; though that matter ought to expand into harmonious proportions, and find utterance in appropriate language, through the ministry of literary culture. Now it is not fair to scan too severely the faults of the young; for they do but exaggerate the bad tendencies of their elders. But it is impossible for those who are habitually conversant with the class that supplies the most numerous recruits to the priesthood not to discern and mourn over the prevalence of a disposition most alien to moral earnestness, profound conviction, spiritual fervour. Up to the very verge of taking Orders (I will not follow them further), the mass of our undergraduates exhibit a frivolity, a self-indulgence, a frantic and reeling devotion to amusement, an instinctive and confirmed shrinking from severe application, a heedlessness of their future and *proximately* future requirements, an apparent incapacity to grasp what I may call the uncovenanted behests of present duty, and to interest themselves in the awful facts and relations of the unseen world, that are truly appalling. And worse still, friends, even parents, too often, if they do not actually love to have it so, take all this very lightly, and contrast it favourably with what they imagine to be worse evils. The dear boy is idle and extravagant, and the examiners are hard on him. But he is so good at bottom, and so gentlemanly, and amiable, and so manly, he really does train so hard—for athletics! And then too he is not as other men are—argumentative, captious, and sceptical; he has not had his mind unbinged and his faith shaken by Professors' lectures. So ladies call him "nice;" and gentlemen casually observe, "he is only sowing his wild oats." Yes

ladies and gentlemen! *Vive la bagatelle!* It is the order of the day. But there is another side to the picture. Who is it that hath said "Because thou art neither hot nor cold, I will spue thee out of my mouth?" Do these awful words afford any sanction or encouragement to this epicurean standard of academic and ante-clerical life? And, humanly speaking, is such a poor foolish boy likely to develop very speedily into an earnest and awakening preacher? May not a long and sad experience, and the fiery trial of suffering, be required ere he can rightly take his place among the prophets, and preach the Cross to a light-minded and luxurious generation? It is almost superfluous to remark, what I add only lest I should be supposed to forget or ignore it, that from a variety of causes the best men are now habitually, and (I fear) more and more, attracted away to other callings. I shall have a word more to say on this later. Turning to the head of remedies, it would seem very obvious to propose the negative one, that no one not properly qualified should undertake to preach in public. But vested interests are strong; and self-love is not a stern critic. And the privilege of delivering sermons, even bad sermons, seems more or less involved in the institution of an Established Church. But if the beneficed clergy, as such, must as a rule be their own "triers," is it essential that all curates, fit or unfit, should preach? And have I not shown cause to infer that many must at first be most unfit? *Fiat experimentum in corpore vili*. Is it not a strong measure to hand over a Christian congregation, Sunday by Sunday, to the experimental preludes of an unskilled performer? At least, should not this be done as rarely as may be, especially if better may be done? Which I hope to show is the case. I proceed to such positive remedies as it is here convenient to enter upon; and would suggest—1. That more systematic attention be paid at schools to English composition; and that it be made a continuous *sine qua non* with all boys in the upper forms. It is quite a vulgar error to suppose that, proper care being taken and stimulus applied, the majority of boys cannot learn to think, and write essays. Great talents and original stupidity are (I believe) equally rare. But we make eventual dunces by acquiescing in the plea of inability, and shirking the labour, care, and method essential but adequate to conquer it betimes. Cultivate, by interesting the mind, and above all stimulate the *will* early; and the intellectual cloud will be dispelled, and the sun of heaven-imparted intelligence shine forth; and the child will father a capable, though not perhaps a brilliant, man. 2. Assuming that it is hopeless to raise the level of the University pass schools, so as to require even moderate proficiency in literary composition, every proper effort must be made, every proper encouragement afforded, to induce undergraduates to read for honours, and to read in the right way. Whether an English essay might not with advantage be exacted in all class schools—whether something in this way might not be arranged in connexion with the classmen's so-called "Divinity,"—is worth consideration. 3. I shrink from the delicate subject of examinations for Orders. The more so as other considerations than abstract fitness here come in. In particular, if a given number of clergy are absolutely required, it is almost inevitable that the standard should be indefinitely lowered. But neither a Bishop nor his examining chaplain ought to be placed in so painful a dilemma, nor would he, had all parties previously done their duty. How far Theological Colleges can supply either the simple literary or the general theological and spiritual training, depends of course upon circumstances. But I cannot help thinking that, on the whole, a young and backward aspirant to the ministry would do better to ask such assistance as (if I may by way of illustration venture on a personality) the present Vicar of Doncaster is in the habit of affording. And this opinion was (I know) expressed on one occasion by the late Mr. Rickards, of Stowlangtoft, no bad judge. 4. The two last suggestions, however, are but thrown out as palliatives and provisional. The real remedy for the intellectual and in no slight degree for the moral deficiency, is a theological honour School at the University. I am not ignorant either of the objections urged against this institution, or of the difficulties which might attend its working. But the former do not appear to me at all conclusive, especially as against so great a want; and the latter, surely, it is the business of what we are so often told is an English Church University to obviate. Is it not a scandal that a large proportion of the clerical *alumni* of such a University should at least enter on their professional career virtually, in all the higher senses of the word, uneducated? And rivalry, competition, the prospect of distinction in their future lives, will alone avail to educate them. In a higher world it may be otherwise. But here "progression by antagonism" is the law of our life, the condition of our excellence. 5. The Prayer Book contemplates several services during the day. But does it contemplate several sermons? Or sermons as an invariable concomitant of prayers? Would it not be well to assume that one good sermon in a day is enough for a man or woman; as at

Radley and elsewhere (and I believe with good effect) it has long been ruled to be enough for a boy? And to allow those who ought to have the free disposition of their time and devotional arrangements to choose, where there are more than one, whether they will attend all or which? A short interval between the prayers and the sermon might effect this; and those who retired might be replaced by others who had been at other services, and might or might not have been at other sermons. Then the attendance would be really voluntary, to the stimulation (as I have shown) of the preacher, and the improvement of his sermon. 6. The establishment of the special Lenten Sermons is a step in a direction which I would prosecute much farther. Out of the clergy generally, or in each diocese, I would propose the more or less permanent appointment of a body of Select Preachers, who should be employed throughout the year especially in towns, and in country parishes where the congregation was large, or where it seemed otherwise desirable (by arrangement of course with the incumbent). The advantages of this plan, properly carried out, would be, I am convinced, many and great. They might replace in a great measure, if not altogether, those who are unequal at present to the task of preaching properly at all. They would also afford relief to those who are now, though perfectly capable in the abstract, compelled to over-preach themselves, and therefore to preach badly. They would, by enabling the latter class to do justice to their powers, indirectly re-attract to *them* congregations who are now repelled by the constrained indifference of their discourses. But the special preachers would do more than this. They would raise the standard of preaching in many ways, and not only of preaching, but if I mistake not, of clerical qualifications and efficiency generally. They would serve to some extent as models to their less gifted and accomplished brethren; and, if I may venture on the expression, put them on their mettle. They would make congregations wholesomely alive to good teaching, and I do not say more, but more *rationality*, exigent of it than now. And further, if the appointment were perfectly fair and open, and were properly remunerated, and treated as it ought to be, that is, as constituting *one* very strong moral ground for preferment, it would induce many a clergyman, whose powers now lie more or less fallow, to cultivate them more assiduously; with a view to attaining a position of honourably and independently earned distinction, usefulness, and advancement. And which of us laymen shall cast the first stone at a clergyman who aspires to such advancement, so earned? Lastly, it would do much to obviate the objection, which not only able and promising young men, but their so-called practical friends and advisers are so apt to urge and to act upon, that the Church offers no certain career and no sufficiently obvious and publicly recognised test of clerical proficiency; and would thus, I cannot but hope, eventually attract many into her service whose great powers and energetic exertions she can by no means afford to lose, but who at present are wont to turn elsewhere, at the dictates of (I must repeat) no illaudable ambition.

THE BISHOP OF OXFORD: Only, my Lord Archbishop, at your special requirement do I say a single word upon this subject, after the papers which I have been listening to with such extreme interest. I may venture, perhaps, to make a single remark on the last speaker's observations, on behalf of a set of men in whom I feel a special interest, and who, I think, were a little unfairly handled. I mean those unhappy "boys" trotted out before us with such unmerciful exhibition. In the first place, you see it is impossible for these young clergymen to be other than young, and I think it is a very unfair thing to attack a man for that which it is wholly out of his power by any means to help. In the next place, I think it is an evil which every single day the poor young man lives is amended. And then, really, to be quite serious about it, in the name of our Universities, and of the young men preparing for Holy Orders, I do not admit the strict literal truth of the character that was drawn. I do not admit that the mass of young men preparing for Holy Orders in my own University are the light-headed, light-handed, luxurious, self-indulgent, idle, dissipated, thoughtless creatures that a man would have carried away the idea they were, from some words that dropped from the last speaker. But though I say this, I do feel at the same time, perhaps as strongly as any man, the need of deepening the preparation if you want to mend the result. For the great thing is this. It is admitted that the sermons are the main teaching of the great bulk of our people in the separate parishes; that therefore, if these people are to receive really themselves a dogma, which dogma is embodied Christianity, they must be taught from sermons, and if taught in sermons, the teacher must himself have first embodied it. The first condition, therefore, of all, it seems to me, in mending matters in this respect, lies in two simple things. First, you must deepen in the teacher his knowledge of dogma. I believe that the teaching of those who are preparing for Holy Orders is for the most

part deficient in this respect. There is a great desire to make them earnest and good, so as to prepare them for that higher moral and spiritual part of their function; but there has been a great undervaluing of the need of grounding them thoroughly in the great dogmas of the Christian faith. Therefore we ought to see an amendment there as a beginning. It is with this view, I know, that Diocesan Colleges have been founded, and I cannot myself let any single word, which seems to undervalue the worth of these colleges, pass without entering my solemn protest against it. In the nature of things it is almost impossible that our great Universities should deal thoroughly with this matter. Where our young clergymen, to their infinite advantage, are being trained with our future squires and scientific men, necessarily the amount of teaching must be to an eminent degree unprofessional, that is undogmatical. Where, then, are they to get it? In the first place, they cannot remain at the University: parents cannot keep them after the degree has been obtained. If they do remain, there are inconveniences resulting from their past life and habits, from their associations with men who have not prepared themselves for Orders, standing in the way of their devoting their energies to their work. What, then, can promise a better success in the present state of the Church of England than that they should find different places, where every man is bent upon obtaining a knowledge of dogmatic teaching and forming the same character as themselves, so that one may help on instead of keeping another back? This leads me to consider the second great difficulty. It is not only that the dogma should be learned as dogma, but, as was said well and with great reverence by one speaker before, as the person of our Blessed Lord embodies in itself all Christian dogma, the daily life of the future clergyman should be so framed and fashioned that it should be receiving into its own spiritual texture, as living realities, the dogma that he is learning as an intellectual truth. I think these are the two conditions we want: God grant we may have increasing means amongst us of seeing them carried out. Else everything must fall. You cannot by any process of hydraulics get a supply of water out of an empty well; you must fill the well thoroughly, and the filling of it is the intellectual apprehension and the living grasp of Christian dogma. Then your sermons will not be empty flatulent, nor banally dogmatic. The suggestion of an order of Preachers, upon which I had intended to speak when invited to address the meeting, is an excellent one. It is impossible in the nature of the case to suppose you can make 14,000 good, solid young Englishmen orators like the two Irish dignitaries who have spoken to-day. One single more illustration of what has passed. Unless you do make the dogma a part of the teacher who is to teach dogmatically, you will have every sermon like the excellently read paper of my excellent friend Canon Shirley. Nobody listens to the *paper* unless the *man* is here; there is not the living vitality behind it. You think of the sick man in his room in Oxford, and have the deepest sympathy for him, but you have not the least inclination to listen to his lucubrations. You must make your young clergymen learned in the Church's lore, and living the Church's life. Then the difficulty has been sufficiently solved.

THE REV. CANON WOODGATE: I am of opinion that the subject now before us is one of the most important which could occupy the attention of the Congress. I felt most thankful when our revered Primate in his sermon referred to the hostility shewn to dogmatic teaching, as among the greatest of the enemies against which the Church has to contend in these days. In my opinion, that question is the key of the position which the Church has to defend in these days. At the same time, when I first saw the subject announced, I very much doubted whether it was one which could be discussed with advantage in a meeting like the present. There is so much popular ignorance on the subject—such inveterate prejudice—such unwillingness to listen to anything which interferes with what is called the right of private judgment—that direct Scripture proofs are questioned and explained away; while the collateral arguments drawn from analogy, and the adaptation of the whole system to our moral nature are more adapted to scholastic and quiet discussion than the tone of thought prevalent in a popular assembly. I am by no means surprised at the hostility shewn to dogmatic teaching. It strikes a summary blow at human pride and pretensions. Even with good men, the religious Protestant feels that it places a barrier before his private interpretation of Scripture; while the unbelieving Protestant feels it interfere still more in his way of dealing with Scripture. It is a peculiar feature of this day, that scarcely any one repudiates Scripture as such. No, they profess to receive it, but they claim the right to deal with it as they like. To all these dogma offers a check; and hence their hostility. The age has been called one of intellectual advancement. It may seem ungracious and presumptuous to

deny it—but I do deny it. I admit to the full the advancement in physical science, and all that tends to the material prosperity of the country, and the comfort of its members; and I am grateful to the eminent men through whose instrumentality these discoveries are made; only I could wish that, instead of taking the credit to themselves alone, they would regard themselves more as the channels through which it has pleased God to make these things known at the time, when the advancement of His kingdom seemed most to require it. But the mere reception of this knowledge, the mere acquaintance with these facts, no more constitutes intellectual advancement and strength on the part of the many, than the rapidity of motion afforded by a railway constitutes bodily vigour, or indicates bodily activity. If anything would tend to give one a low idea of the pure intellect of the age, it would be the profound ignorance shewn, and the sheer nonsense spoken and listened to, written and read, on the subject of dogmatic teaching. Individuals have no right to have dogmatic systems made easy, else they would cease to be systems. I would fearlessly ask any one in this Hall, I would ask any one in the whole world, to point out to me any one subject which is not dogmatically taught, and assent to its principles peremptorily demanded of the learner. On every subject capable of being reduced to system, and having its own principles and rules it must be so, and protest or private judgment be disallowed. If the Gospel were not taught dogmatically, I can only say it would be the only exception in the wide range of moral and scientific truth: nor, among the various collateral evidences which the Church, no less than the Gospel itself, possesses, is there any more strong than that which is furnished by the analogy in this respect to every other kind of truth, and its adaptation to the wants of our nature. I would ask any objector to dogmatic truth, how he would convey instruction on any definite subject without asserting its dogma. I would ask any mother how she would teach her child arithmetic, if he questioned the dogmatic statements of the multiplication table? I would ask any schoolmaster or tutor how he would go on with any mathematical pupil who, in the exercise of his private judgment, questioned the axioms and postulates of Euclid? And let me ask what is the difference between an axiom and a dogma; they both claim peremptorily and authoritatively, and on the same principle, an unhesitating acceptance of the truth they assert. The one appeals to the universal sense of mankind, the other to the decision of those who are the legitimate and authorised judges and representatives of the present question. In moral and religious truth it is the same, and no less in all the range of subjects which lie between pure demonstrative truth and moral truth. Poetry, painting, sculpture, architecture, music, all have their recognised principles, all have their dogmas; and to those who will not, as learners, accept those dogmas in all doubt, the teacher speaks not. Is the highest of all subjects to be the only exception to the universal rule? Is the noblest work of God to be antagonistic to the course and institution of nature? I do not mean to say that private judgment is excluded on these subjects. In all matters which do not touch the *principles* of a sermon or subject, there are many questions of detail on which private judgment is allowed; but where the principles are concerned, it is silenced. And in like manner there are many points in Holy Scripture, not trenching on the authority of the Creeds and the Church dogmatic teaching, which may be called open questions. Of this kind are, for example, the interpretation and application of parables,—the future of unfulfilled prophecy,—the intermediate state,—the restoration of the Jews to their own land and nation. But when the Creeds are concerned, all is dogma; and the Church, in delivering children back to their sponsors that they may be brought up in the faith in which they have just been baptized, does not order that they shall receive a copy of the Holy Scriptures that they may therein learn their faith, but that they shall learn the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments, and be further instructed in the Church Catechism (a compilation of dogmas) set forth for that purpose. And when this has been done in due course, the Scriptures are put into their hands that they "may know the certainty of those things in which they have been instructed." And this rule is also that of Holy Scripture. There is no authority whatever in the New Testament for saying that it alone is the rule of faith as interpreted by individuals. There is no intimation that writings were used in the foundation of the Christian Church,—how could it be when they did not as yet exist?—nor that they were to be used hereafter as the sole guide. St. Paul speaks of what he delivers, and the disciples received—but never of what they had themselves gathered by their own judgment. People refer to the case of the Bereans as invalidating the dogmatic principle, and as establishing the right of private judgment. But what has that to do with the question? The Bereans searched the Scriptures not to see what they could find there, but whether what Paul had said really was in accordance with the Jewish Scriptures, the

Jews having affirmed that it was not. But will any one pretend to say that the Bereans were at liberty to draw their own conclusion—that they were at liberty to come to a contrary conclusion (which the right of private judgment involves) without forfeiting their claim to the salvation which St. Paul was commissioned to offer? If the Bereans had said we have searched the Scriptures and have come to the conclusion that these things are not as you say, would St. Paul, in the language of our day, have said, Well, it is of no consequence, be persuaded in your own mind—there must be difference of opinion on these matters? We must not forget that the unbelieving Jews did, in the exercise of their private judgment, come to a contrary conclusion after searching the Scriptures in their own way, and we know very well what the Apostle said to them. In short, it is impossible to deny that the main evil against which we have to contend in this day, is that against which the principle of dogmatic teaching is immediately opposed—the presumption of the individual mind against authority and testimony. As I observed before, men avoid repudiating Scripture, but claim the right to deal with it as they like. They do not avowedly set themselves against the word of God, but would bend it to their own wish: and they do the same in matters of life and conduct. The Church, in her spiritual guidance, follows the rule of her doctrinal teaching. In all God's dealings with us, whether through Philosophy or Revelation, His object has been to present to us an external standard of truth, and to make our trust consist in bringing ourselves into conforming with that standard. Men's minds rebel against this. The Church in her spiritual guidance follows the rule of her doctrinal teaching. She teaches us to pray that God who alone can order the unruly wills and affections of sinful men, will grant that we may love that which he commands, and desire that which He does promise. But no! men desire them only like Balaam; they wish not to go against the will of God, but instead of raising themselves to a conformity with that will, would bring down that will to a conformity with themselves. They try to show that God commands that which they believe, and promises that which they desire. The time allotted me forbids me to say more; but I feel I am justified in saying at the conclusion what I said at the beginning, that the maintenance of the dogmatic principle and of authoritative teaching is the key of the position which the Church has to hold against the enemy of truth in these days.

The Rev. A. R. FAUSSET: A late prelate on one occasion, listened to a sermon, and at its conclusion he was asked his opinion of it. "The preacher aimed at nothing and he hit it." I believe with Mr. Sidney Owen that the great defect in the pulpit is the want a regular organisation of thought and word. The difference between a mob and an army lies in the one word organisation. Fenelon upon being asked as to his opinion as to the structure of a sermon said, that every sermon that has unity ought to be capable of being reduced to one clear proposition. Depend upon it not so much *multa* as *multum* is what is to be aimed at. Too much may tire the mind of the hearer if indeed he listen at all. There are some preachers of whom the same prelate I have already quoted said "they are reported to have great command of language; but with much greater truth it may be said language has a great command over them." They have about the same command of language that a man has with a horse that runs away with him. One idea should clearly run through the course of a sermon, and the various parts should be made subject to it. There ought to be as it seems to me an exordium to attract the hearer, not too learned; if you want to be understood you must make yourself intelligible. Then should come the deductions and the application. The beginning of the exordium should be of a simple kind to encourage the attention of the hearer and gradually lead on to the subject. Some preachers devote so much time to the beginning that the patience of the hearer is exhausted before they get to the main part of the subject. I heard once of a very learned Scotch divine's sermon about which an old woman, when asked for her opinion, said he was so long laying the cloth that she doubted whether the banquet would ever be served up. Now to pass to the main subject discussed to-day, and leaving the lighter matter which I have used to enlist your attention, I will turn to the word of God. Paul in the 28th of Acts is said to have expounded the Kingdom of God persuading them concerning Jesus. There seems to me here to be a three-fold division. First, there is an exposition of Scripture according to the law and the testimony. That is the true dogma which Scripture sets forth. We are liable continually in our dogmatic statements, when we wander from Scripture, to give some colour to the pure light of Heaven. We should not let our hearers see the light streaming through the windows, and have that faint dim religious light which is so much admired by many; I prefer the broad light of Heaven. I fear sometimes in the same way dogmatic statements are tinged with the language of the speaker rather than with the pure language of

Scripture. The preacher should be very careful that he gives not one syllable short or beyond the very word of God; to the Scripture we should appeal as the infallible standard for all dogma; whatever is contained there is not to be demanded of any one to be believed as a matter of faith. It is asked why preaching is less effective now than in days gone by. It is because it partakes so little of the nature of testimony. If we brought forth the facts that are to be found in abundance in our own pastoral work, in the mission field, speaking as men with hearts filled with the love of Christ, I believe there would be felt the reality and power which gave such effect to the preaching of the Apostles as is recorded in the Acts. And the secret of their success was that they were continually bearing testimony to some great facts that had come within their own experience, and which were the foundation of their whole spiritual life. If the preachers of this day did this, and the hearers felt it was a living man speaking to living men in the name of Jehovah, whose commissions they bore, testifying of God from the Scripture, I believe it would be a great power in convincing the hearts of those that hear. No more powerful remark could be made than that of the Dean of Cork when he said that all dogma was concentrated in the Holy name of Jesus. Let us then testify concerning Him. Bishop Reynolds well said "The Lord Jesus Christ ought to be the diamond that sparkles on the breast of every sermon." This should be our peroration as well as beginning, and we should have the analysis of the text, and the comparison of it with the context to bear upon the one great thing at the end,—“Will you now close with the offer that is given you or will you not? This day may be your last.” That personal application will make the listeners as men who feel the voice of God speaking and inviting them to live and not be lost. Depend upon it the preacher must not leave the nails to drive themselves into the post; he must do it himself.

THE REV. F. A. HILDYARD: I think the last speaker departed a little from the subject when he spoke of preaching in general, and the manner of making it effective to the people, rather than confining himself to the question—how to make preaching effective by means of dogma. As one understands dogma, it is the authorised statements of the Church as contained in the three Creeds, the books of her formularies, and the decrees of the Councils of old. I have heard so much about this necessity of preaching dogma, and you have received it so remarkably well, that its advantages need not be spoken of by me. Rather would I address myself to that other question which ought to be brought before you—namely, how we (clergymen) are to get that necessary dogmatism which the laity seem to approve of in our sermons. One thing that should not be neglected is a greater study of Patristic theology—the study of those primitive Fathers, to whom our Church refers in the Preface to her Prayer-book, as bearing testimony to the truth of those things contained in the formularies. Where did the masters of theology learn their craft? Where did the authors of the standard books of devotion learn that clearness and force of statement of truth which burns through every page? They learnt it in the painful and toilsome study of the primitive Fathers. Open any one of the volumes of the great divines (Pearson and Hooker) which our Bishops commend to the younger clergy, and you will find references large and voluminous to authors whose names are associated with the earliest days of the Church. If there is one thing more than another that would give fullness of statement and vigour to the sermon, it is having mastered the progress of thought in early days, as it is recorded in St. Chrysostom, St. Augustine, and even earlier authors than these. I repeat, if there is one thing above another that will give vigour, it is mastering those dry crabbed treatises upon the early faith. Besides this intellectual training for dogmatic preaching, there is also, I think, that other necessity which exists as well—namely, the throwing off the dryness which the study produces on the man—the dryness and the coldness and formality that unavoidably creeps into the style when the man is sitting without any warmth to be derived from anywhere but his own heart. This must be learned before Patristic learning, knowledge of dogma, can be made effective on the people. What pre-eminently will enable the clergyman, young or old, to use with effect the stores gathered out of the treasures, old and new, is that he himself should year by year learn the devotional application to his own inner life of those truths which it is his duty daily and hourly to proclaim. I would have—and I express the opinion of a society who sent me here to speak to-day, largely developed under Episcopal sanction, and supervision, and appointment,—a system which applies to the hearts and souls of each individual clergyman those truths which he is to proclaim; I mean the system of Retreats for the clergy. I know, because I speak from personal experience, of the deep and inestimable benefit that it is to a clergyman to sit at the feet of some Gamaliel raised high in the Church by his own

sanctity, powers, and broad grasp of truth, to learn of him, and to go out with a new warmth to my own people, having learned from his mouth truths that were no doubt old, but that had been put into shape with a force I never conceived they had before. If all our clergy spent more of their time on their knees, they would have more power of applying dogmatic truths in the pulpit. For when does a man speak with greater warmth and force than when he has God to speak to him first, prompting him how afterwards to speak to those to whom he is sent. The suggestion made to-day, that the Bishops should be largely petitioned by the laity (who are most interested in the question) in their wisdom to organise some national scheme for an order of Preachers should not be lost sight of. I was delighted to hear that advocated, at least sanctioned, by the Bishop of Oxford. It would not be at all necessary to alarm the Christian world by converting it into an order of friars: there would not be the least necessity for any distinctive dress, but there is a necessity for the thing itself. It is lamentable to see a man in a country village wasting away and being eaten out by the rust of sloth, which the deadness and dullness of his own place entails upon him. It is sad to see this, when we are so often hearing complaints of the paucity of the clergy to do the Church's work in large towns. Let the Bishops take this scheme well into their thoughts, and organise it in such a way as to send it forth to the Church under the sanction of their paternal authority. Then, after Patristic learning and an application of it to themselves, clergymen will learn from their knees what to teach the people, and, the Bishops sanctioning them the people will be delighted to hear them. Then we shall no longer hear of empty churches in large towns where there are thousands of souls who, whatever they may say about their own opinions, yearn for nothing so much as the masterly statements of an educated scribe and dedicated priest of the Church of God. For this they desire and yearn, and will go gladly where the clearest statements of the Church's doctrines are put before them—where there is not an atom of reserve, or an atom of that which sometimes characterises pulpits—pondering to the popular taste.

THE REV. W. WALLACE: I fear the eloquence of the Deans of Emly and of Cork will not aid much in showing how to teach dogmatic truth. For few of the clergy could give a luminous exposition of any dogma illustrated by the breadth of Scripture and the facts of nature. Let us settle that what is required, is to educate people up to the standard of God's Holy Word. I say then that the Gospels and Epistles of the New Testament are in themselves adapted to form the faculty of teaching dogmatic truth. I do not undervalue the Creeds of the church, for I can recall my study of Pearson giving me no more truth than was possessed by one who had learned the Athanasian Creed. But let us go a step higher, and I say that not only dogma, but how to use it, is found in the Scripture. Nothing can be truer than the remark made by several of the speakers before, that Christ is himself the great dogma, and, I add, the Apostles lived in this and spake it. Christ too was the great Sacrament while he lived, and it is easy to discover that the Apostles had behind their teaching the ritual and Sacraments of the Church. Provide this basis; and nine-tenths of us need only dictate the sayings of Christ and argue the arguments of the apostles, to teach dogmatic truth in its best form. When, long ago, I thought of having some ground for my feet, I was led to do what the Dean of Emly advised, adopt the course of the Epistles and Gospels of the year, and I have found that it is only necessary to have faith in the written word, and I am supplied with dogma and its best application. How few know that there are skeletons of sermons in the Epistles. How few practically admit that the sayings of Christ are dogmas on His Person and Kingdom. The use of dogma is constant with St. Paul. Why then not rest on inspiration and an Apostle's application to produce faith in dogma. Nothing could so much teach the dogma of the secret communing of Jesus with the Christian soul, as to have put before us an Apostle's use of it. "If so be that ye have heard Him, and have been taught by Him, as the truth is in Jesus." Why not tell our Divinity students that it is not required of them to run after this or that sermon-maker, but that it is best to give life to the sayings of Christ, and to make living the sermons of St. Paul. The Dean of Emly speaks of giving life to the dogma of the creeds: I say, give life to the Gospels and Epistles as they stand. The way is, dictate the sayings of Christ; argue the arguments of the Apostles; and you will have taught the dogmata of the Faith, and in a way sure to bring men to the stature of Christ. This way is easy in its principle, yet will supply increasing scope. It will perfect the man of God, and form the truth of Jesus in the soul. If the clergy would get the real living force and pulse of life from the sermons to be obtained from these sources, they would be much more likely to rise to the "height of the great argument," than if they chose the manner of preaching so often adopted in the present

day. Of course, the study and use of Scripture will be steeped in prayer, and He in whose hands are we and all our words will give the quickening vigour of His own word. Reference has been made by the last speaker to patristic study. How did St. Augustine and St. Chrysostom become the great preachers they were, but by the exposition of the word of God, by the use of the dogmatic teaching of Holy Scripture itself. I venture to say that if you take St. Chrysostom's Homilies, you will find the very divisions you would make in the Apostle's writing, and the same application is required, circumstances differing, at this very day. Lay the concerns of the people before the Head of the Church, and rise up and use His word. To dictate the sayings of Christ and argue the arguments of the Apostles,—this is the sure way of establishing generally dogmatic teaching in the pulpits. There may not be the imagination or the fervour of the Deans, but it is enough to have spoken as the oracles of God.

His Grace the PRESIDENT pronounced the benediction.

CONCERT ROOM. WEDNESDAY MORNING.

The Right Hon. The LORD FEVERSHAM in the Chair.

DIOCESAN AND PAROCHIAL ORGANIZATION.

THE REV. CANON ATLAY, D.D., READ THE FOLLOWING PAPER:—

Of the two subjects which are to be brought before this section this morning, let me say at the outset that I am about to address you on the first; and let me bespeak your favourable attention whilst I lay before you some remarks on "Diocesan Organization." First, however, begging you to remember that although in this room, I may be in a great measure speaking *ad clerum*, I am writing *ad populum*, and for a much larger circle than that which is circumscribed by these walls. If I am treading, therefore, from time to time, on ground very familiar to those who have considered this question, and are better informed upon the subject very likely than myself, let me beg them to remember that if the point is to be popularly weighed it must be presented in a popular form: and that from the very nature of the subject most of the information upon it is to be gathered from books which the vast majority of people never look into. Originality, therefore, or novelty of views, is not what I have aimed at, or what you must expect; I shall be doing my work most effectually if I can compress into a paper of twenty-five minutes' length what Hooker, and Bingham, and Dean Field, and Gibson, and others have stored in several volumes. If I can exhume from Blue Books and other sepulchral caverns what Commissioners and others have recommended from time to time, I shall feel that I shall have discharged the office which has been intrusted me far more usefully than by an elaborate essay on the subject.

I proceed at once, then, to give you some account of the organization of a diocese.

What different ideas, when you seriously consider the point, are suggested to different minds by the very term which I have just used! We must pause one moment on the threshold, and consider what a *diocese* really is.

What is the original notion then of a diocese? It is imported into our Ecclesiastical terminology from classical shores; and as in the mouth of a Roman it would mean a 'district,' a 'department,' a

'portion of a province under the administration of a Prætor,' so, by a very natural transition, in the mouth of an Ecclesiastic it would mean a 'portion of a province under the government of a Bishop.'

It will be within the knowledge of many to whom I am now speaking that the word *diocese* did not assume its present meaning before the age of Constantine, at the commencement of the fourth century of the Christian era; the ancient name for an episcopal diocese for 300 years being commonly *parish*.¹ The neglect of this distinction led I cannot but think to a mistake in Mosheim, who tells us "that for the first two centuries a bishop had charge of a *single* church, which might ordinarily be contained in a private house." I think it probable that Suicer is right in his account of this matter: and the ninth book of Bingham is full of information upon the point. It was from the State in all probability that the Church took her model, and on lines suggested to her by *State* arrangements that her ship was built.

"A *province* was the cities of a whole region subjected to the authority of one chief magistrate who resided in the metropolis or chief city of the province, a prætor commonly, or proconsul, or some magistrate of the like eminence and dignity. A *diocese* was a still larger district, containing several provinces within the compass of it; in the capital city of which district a more general magistrate had his residence, whose power extended over the whole diocese to receive appeals, and determine all causes that were referred to him for a new hearing, from any city within the district. And as in every metropolis or chief city of each province there was a superior magistrate above the magistrates of every single city, so likewise in the same metropolis there was a bishop whose power extended over the whole province; in all places therefore the See of the Bishop was fixed to the civil metropolis: except in Africa, where the primate was commonly the *senior* bishop of the province. And in like manner, as the State had a *vicarius* in every capital city of each civil diocese, so the Church in progress of time came to have her *exarchs* or *patriarchs* in many, if not in all the capital cities of the empire."²

Not, indeed, that the Church was tied absolutely to follow this model; great regard was had, no doubt, in settling the limits of dioceses and other districts, and modelling the external polity of the Church, to the rules of the State, and many things were ordered in conformity to the measure observed in the Roman empire, but she did not tie herself absolutely, and fetter her freedom of action. She did not servilely copy her pattern: she never for instance had an universal bishop in imitation of an universal emperor; nor four grand spiritual administrators answering to the four great Ministers of State,³ as arranged by Constantine: and so of many other points of difference; but so far as she judged the arrangement expedient and conducive to the ends of her own spiritual government and discipline, she followed the model to which which she was familiar by reason of the arrangement in the State.

Her dioceses, therefore, varied in size; some were very large others very small, according as the civil government of each city happened to have a larger or lesser jurisdiction, and, as would

(1) See Hooker, vii., 8, 7, and Field, v., 28. (2) See Bingham, ix., 1, 3, and 4.

(3) See Gibbon, chap. xvii.

naturally be expected, the dioceses were not generally so large in nations of the first conversion as in those converted in the middle ages of the Church. The number of Bishops in England for instance bore no proportion to the number of those in Asia Minor, though the island of Great Britain is not much inferior to it in size. But whatever the size of the diocese might be there was in the main the same system of organization prevalent. The mode of government was the same; the Bishop was entrusted with a solemn charge; he had an authority given him which he was to 'use not to destruction but to salvation; not to hurt, but to help.' When 'admitted to Government in the Church of Christ, which He purchased with no less price than the effusion of His own blood,' the Bishops were not to lord it over God's heritage, but carefully to 'execute the office whereunto they were called, to the edifying of the Church, and to the honour, praise, and glory of God's name.'

It would be impossible of course for this great work to be carried on by them single handed; it would be imperative upon them methodically to arrange their dioceses, and by organization to effect that which without system and regular arrangement it would have been impossible for them to have carried through. Certain portions of their office they could delegate to others; some ordinances there were which they alone were qualified to administer; and in those affairs indeed which were common to them and their presbyters, as Bingham¹ and Hooker² are very careful to point out to us, the authority on which the parties respectively acted was quite distinct: the Bishop being the absolute, independent minister of the Church, and doing whatever he did by his own authority, solely inherent in himself: the presbyters being his assistants merely, authorised to perform such offices as he intrusted them with, or gave them commission and directions to perform, which still they did by his authority, and in dependence upon him as their ecclesiastical superior. He was the head of the diocese; the fountain of order therein, 'for the Bishop is the man to whom the Lord's people is committed, and he must give an account of their souls.'³

I do not propose in this paper to give an outline even of episcopal work—it is neither necessary nor becoming to do so—but one point there is to which in my judgment special attention should be drawn, I mean the primitive regulations with respect to *preaching*. It is impossible to read the ancient records without seeing the stress which was always laid upon this part of a Bishop's work. It was so much the office and custom of Bishops to preach, that no presbyter was permitted to preach in their presence—in the Western Church especially—till the time of St. Augustine, who, whilst he was a presbyter was commissioned by his Bishop to preach before him, to the great scandal of many of the Episcopal Bench of that day.⁴ But if the Bishops had leisure to devote themselves to the faithful and effective discharge of that part of their office it would seem that their dioceses must have been of such a manageable size as to enable them thus to give attention to preaching the Word of God.

My point, let it be remembered, in this paper is to speak of the Organization of a Diocese; or I would gladly have said a few words

(1) See Bingham ii., 3, 2.

(2) Hooker vii., throughout.

(3) Can. Apost. c., 39.

(4) Bingham i., 3, 4.

with respect to the relation in which a Bishop stood towards the Church at large. Dioceses were but limits of convenience for the preservation of order in times of peace: but the Faith once delivered to the saints was a more universal thing, and when any danger threatened *that*,—whenever the faith was in danger of being subverted by heresy, or destroyed by persecution,—then the whole would become but one diocese, and the whole Church but one flock, and every pastor thought himself obliged to feed his Master's sheep according to his power, whatever part of the world they were scattered in. But the compass of their dioceses and the nature of the work therein must have been such as to give them time and opportunity to prepare themselves for the work: and it is to this *providential* arrangement that we owe the treasures that have been bequeathed to us by the earlier bishops, whether as regards the confirmation and defence of the faith, or the elucidation of God's Word, or the edifying of our own individual consciences.

But it is time that we considered some of the machinery (so to call it) by which a diocese of old would be worked—and here I shall but epitomise a chapter of Field on the Church, as giving the clearest statement on this head that has fallen in my way.¹

He tells us that for the more easy governing of the churches where the dioceses were large and the parishes widely scattered, some of the Bishops in ancient times would delegate part of their authority to some principal men who might act for them in their absence, and discharge some of the peculiar functions of their office. These were called Chorepiscopi, Rural Bishops (for I unhesitatingly reject any other derivation of the word).² Whether these had the power of performing all the offices of a Bishop, I do not now enquire very curiously: they who have considered the question know how apparently conflicting the opinions on the subject are. It appears to me, however, that their power varied at different times; and that beyond all question in some ages of the Church they were Bishops in the fullest and properest sense of the term; the very terms of the 57th canon of Laodicea, which substituted another class of persons for them, proving to my mind, that at that date, they were bishops in possession of episcopal functions.³ They seem to have disappeared in the ninth century, in the Western Church at all events.

The following is Burn's account of them:

'In former times many Bishops had their suffragans who were also consecrated as other bishops were. These in the absence of the Bishops upon embassies, or in multiplicity of business, did supply their places in matters of orders, but not of jurisdiction'—which I specially dwell on for a moment in order that I may quote the remark of one of our ablest canonists, Bishop Gibson, who says that the duties of a Bishop, being of two separate and distinct kinds, *quæ sunt jurisdictionis* and *quæ sunt ordinis*, the former are performed by a coadjutor—a *περιουδότης* as he would be termed of old—'not necessarily of the episcopal order—but the latter by a suffragan.'

These suffragans, continues Dr. Burn, were anciently called *Chorepiscopi*, or bishops of the country, by way of distinction from the proper Bishop of the *City* or *See*.

(1) V. xxix. (2) See Gibson's *Codex*, p. 156. (3) See Suicer, Vol. ii., p. 677.

I think perhaps it may be doubted whether the learned author has used the word Suffragan here in its proper sense; at any rate it is well to avoid any confusion in our minds on the subject. There is a clear distinction I mean between what I may call the technical and the general use of the term. 'Anciently Suffragan Bishops were all the city Bishops of a province under the metropolitans; who were called his suffragans because they met at his command to give their suffrage, counsel, or advice in a provincial synod.'¹ And in this sense the word was used in England in the middle of the fifteenth century. Just hear Lyndwood's comment upon one of Peckham's constitutions, wherein the word *suffraganeis* occurs. 'They were called suffragans because they were bound to give their suffrage and assistance to the Archbishop, being summoned to take part in his care, though not in the plenitude of his power.'

Technically, however, the word Suffragan is applied—as in the well-known Act of Henry VIII., for instance, and in discussions of the present day—to a class resembling the chorepiscopi of old, but not, strictly speaking, suffragans at all.

I return, however, to the Dean of Gloucester's² account of the organization of a diocese.

Whatsoever, he says, we may think of these *chorepiscopi*, the Bishops in former times, for the better government of their Churches, chose out certain of their presbyters to assist them in the supervision and direction of the rest, whom they first named Arch-presbyters, and afterwards Deans; the name of *decanus* or dean being first used to note out such a prefect or governor of monks, as had the rule of ten monks living together in common. The Arch-presbyters which Bishops anciently appointed to assist them were of two sorts, such as lived in the great church in the city, called therefore *Urbani*, and such as lived abroad in the country, called therefore *Vicani*, or *Rurales*, rural arch-presbyters or rural deans; where you see the original of one of the present modes of diocesan organization, the office I mean of *Rural Dean*.³

It will occur perhaps to some hearers or readers of this paper that I have proceeded in a very irregular order; for that I have spoken of *Rural Deans* before I have said one word about the *Archdeacons*; but the Archdeacons themselves will not think so, for they know the original of their office, however much it may have been improved upon in modern days.

Though Archdeacons in these last ages of the Church, says Bingham,⁴ have usually been of the order of presbyters, yet anciently they were no more than deacons. At their first institution (which was about the latter end of the third century) their proper business was to attend the Bishop at the altar; to direct the deacons and other inferior officers in their several duties for the orderly performance of Divine Service; to attend the Bishop at Ordinations; and to assist him in the management of the revenues of the Church; but without anything that may be called jurisdiction, in the present sense of the word, either in the cathedral or out of it.

I am not advocating any alteration in the relative position of Arch-deacon and Arch-presbyter; I am only sketching the original of

(1) Bingham ii., 14, 14. (2) Field v., 29. (3) See Gibson's Codex, p. 1010. (4) Bingham ii., 21, 1.

each office; and it is not difficult to see how an office, originally inferior, by degrees took the place of the superior office, and the Arch-deacon rose superior to the Arch-presbyter. The Archdeacon being always near the Bishop, and the person mainly trusted by him, would naturally be selected for the performance of many employments which the Bishop was prevented from attending to. Being the chief among the deacons, which are but church-servants, they were more attendant about the Bishop for the despatch of all public business than presbyters. Very naturally, therefore, they would be sent to make enquiry in any case which might require it, but had no power to correct what was amiss. Afterwards, in process of time, they were authorized to hear and determine trifling matters, and to reform the lighter and lesser offences; to perform, in fact, the work of visitation for the Bishop. And thus by prescription they claimed the correction of greater things; so that Archdeacons (who at first might not *sit* in the presence of a presbyter without his leave) in the end became, by reason of this their employment by the Bishop, to be greater not only than the ordinary presbyters, but than the Arch-presbyters themselves; the very *eye* and *heart* of the Bishop, being likely to attain an authority which the very greatest of the presbyters would aspire to in vain.

So you see how the apparent anomaly is to be accounted for.

I have one other topic to broach in connection with this subject of organization. Besides the Deans or Archpresbyters, whom the Bishops used for the governing and overseeing of certain parts of the diocese allotted to them, with such limitation as they pleased, and for counsel and advice in managing their weightiest affairs, and the Archdeacons whom they used as eyes in all places, and trusted with the despatch of what they thought fit; they had certain of their clergy skilful in the laws and canons of the church, whom they used as *officials* or *chancellors* to *hear* all manner of causes, but not to meddle in the censuring or punishing of criminal things, or in any matters of office; and *vicars general* who in case of absence or sickness of the Bishop might do any thing almost that pertaineth to the Bishop's jurisdiction.

Such is a slight sketch of the organization by which our earlier Bishops in this land were enabled in some degree to superintend and administer their dioceses; such are the main features of the system of administration now to be found amongst us. Is the machinery adequate for the work? Can a Bishop of one of our overgrown dioceses by means of such an organization make himself felt as the centre of operations in his proper sphere?

I think it is admitted on all hands that some relief is necessary, and I have put together these sheets in hopes of raising a discussion upon the point. For my own part I will say that under whatever aspect I contemplate the episcopal office, the more forcibly I am struck with the necessity of affording some relief to our over-worked governors in the church. It is no part of my present duty to dictate how this may best be done; whether by sub-division of overgrown sees, or the revival of suffragan Bishops in accordance with the unrepealed Act of Henry VIII. (26 Henry VIII., c. 14.), which for convenience of reference I propose to print at the end of this paper.¹ There is much to be said on both questions, my own feelings move me rather

in the latter direction, and I would very earnestly recommend to the thoughtful consideration of the Congress, Archdeacon Hale's charges on this question. Bishop Gibson's reflection in the earlier part of the last century is to my apprehension a very weighty one. "This Act being as much in force as ever, and having so effectually restrained suffragans from every possibility of encroaching upon their Bishops, or being uneasy to them, and the institution being of such evident use in large dioceses, and under infirm and aged Bishops, especially for the work of confirmation, it is humbly referred to the wisdom of our governors to enquire for what causes they have been so long disused, and to consider how far the revival of them would be serviceable to the Church of Christ."

If the time served it would be proper and expedient, I think, that I should enter more particularly into details upon this question,—as to the position, for instance, which suffragans would occupy; but I am in hopes that it will be taken up by some of the speakers who will address us by and bye. At present perhaps it may be doubted whether the public mind is familiarised sufficiently with the notion of these titular or suffragan Bishops. But the day will come, I am sanguine enough to believe, when we shall more rightly understand the matter, and perhaps marvel at the prejudice or want of acquaintance with the subject, which has so long withheld so simple a remedy for an acknowledged disorder. It is one advantage of these periodical Congresses that an opportunity is thus afforded of bringing the question before the public mind, *non vi sed saepe cadendo*. But whatever we may think let us do something; let us agitate in our various homes so far as our other duties will permit; let us try and keep the point well before the public mind, that if parochial organization is indispensable for the well-being of a parish, diocesan organization is essential for the well ordering of a diocese; and that, in point of fact, it is an anomaly of preposterous magnitude, that whilst the population of our dioceses is increasing with a rapidity unprecedented, whilst the number of Priests and Deacons is increasing,—though in a ratio very unequal to the wants of the case,—the number of superior officers in this vast army is only greater by *one* than it was three hundred years ago.

There is just one other aspect of the question to which I would like to draw your attention before I finish, and it is this. I have regarded the subject solely from *within*; it ought to be looked at also from *without*. "One great objection against the present diocesan episcopacy, and that which to many may look the most plausible, is drawn from the vast extent and greatness of most of the northern dioceses of the world, which makes it so extremely difficult for one man to discharge all the offices of the episcopal function."¹ It is with a view to recommending this work of Church Government—so agreeable to the model and practice of the Primitive Church—so conducive as I think to the maintenance and diffusion of the pure light of the Gospel—it is with a view of recommending this mode of episcopal regimen to all Protestant Churches, that I would have it presented to the world in its fairest proportions; and I conclude in the words of Bingham "that if ever it shall please God to dispose the hearts of our brethren in the Churches of the Reformation, to receive again the

(1) Bingham, ix. 8, the conclusion.

Primitive form of Episcopacy (which is much to be wished) there needs be no difficulty from this objection to hinder so useful and peaceable a design ; because every church is at liberty to contract her own dioceses and limit them with such bounds as she judges for the expediency and benefit of the whole community ; there being no geometrical rule prescribed us about this, either in the writings of the Apostles, or in the laws and practice of the Primitive Church, any further than that every city or place of civil jurisdiction should be the seat of an ecclesiastical magistracy, a Bishop with his presbytery to order the spiritual concerns of men, as the other does the temporal."

THE REV. W. CADMAN READ THE FOLLOWING PAPER ON PAROCHIAL ORGANIZATION.

OF all the important subjects discussed at this Congress, there is none more important than that which we are now considering.

It is one which concerns the glory of Christ, the salvation of souls, and the responsibilities of our position as those who ought to be good stewards of the grace which has been given.

For the object aimed at is nothing less than this, to bring all those who are committed to our charge to that agreement in the faith and knowledge of God, and to that ripeness and perfectness of age in Christ, that there shall be no place left among us, either for error in religion or for viciousness in life.

Nor can it be *justly* said that the discussions of matters like this in a Church Congress end only in talk.

It pleased God to give me peculiarly favourable opportunities of gaining some experience of the difficulties, and duties, and encouragements of a clergyman in the midst of a large population.

I could not hesitate to give the results of experience when asked to state my views of the hopefulness of Parochial work, and of Parochial organization and management, in the Congresses held in the Universities and at Manchester. There was nothing remarkable in what was said,—nothing that had not been done, or would not have been done by others similarly circumstanced. But there were those present who determined to try for five years, at least, the scheme of parochial organization of which I had spoken. And, having been favoured with communications from them, I am now ready, with your permission, to give the results of their experience as well as my own.

The plan adopted and advocated by me contemplated a large increase in the number of clergymen attached to any given Church, so that, however large the parish, there should be one clergyman for every 2000 or 3000 persons. It suggested the subdivision of a large parish into manageable districts, which should not be separated from the mother Church, except as each district became capable, and without injury to the rest of the parish, of supporting its own parochial machinery. A chapel or school-church was to be planted amidst every group of parishioners who, either from distance cannot attend the mother Church, or from habit do not. But the clergyman ministering in it was to have periodical services in the Church, to which he should bring the people amongst whom he laboured.

Now the result of the discussion or conversation that then took place has been, the employment of at least sixteen additional clergymen in various populous parishes. They have been provided by the united liberality and zeal of clergymen and laymen, aided in some cases by small grants from the Additional Curates' Society, so as to make each curate's income at least £120 a year.

We must not say that Congresses end in talk, when the result of one of them was the calling of a public meeting by a Christian layman, in an important town, at which it was resolved ;—

“That five additional curates in Priests' orders be provided for the town. That each curate shall have a district assigned for him to work by the Rector, or Incumbent, with a population not exceeding 2500. Such curate, under the direction of the Rector or Incumbent, to confine himself to ministering to the wants of those within his district, bringing the services of the Church home to them, regularly holding services amongst them within the district, and occasionally for them at the Church.”

We must not say that Congresses end in talk, when we are told that the above plan had been barely in operation a year, when it was announced that it was taken up and worked out in a neighbouring town, and that four additional clergymen were beginning their work there ; and, when, further, we are told, in the second year's report, that a third town had taken up the same plan, and that there were four curates there also already at work.

But these are the results of the Congress. What, then, are the results of the proposed plan ? I have been favoured with reports from those who are well qualified to give them, and from these I select the following :—

“Two additional curates are at work in the parish, for one of their districts a Church is to be consecrated next month.” In the temporary Church of a third, ‘the services are well attended, the offertory is collected after every service, and is considerable, I think about 25s.’ ”

Another report states, that a solid and substantial work, under God's blessing, is being done in the town. One of the Missionary clergy testifies that a school opened in the beginning of the year with thirty children, had then 200 ; and he adds, “I wish it to be clearly understood that my congregation is not composed of the members of any other congregation, Church or Dissent, and that the scholars in my school have not been drawn away from other schools. If increased and increasing congregations and schools be a test of success, no inconsiderable amount has been vouchsafed to operations within this district.”

“I am satisfied,” says the Incumbent of another district, “that a good work is being done which, though slow, is sure.” “Many pious Dissenters have become regular attendants at Church, at the school-room services, or at both.”

A Missionary clergyman writes, under date of October 1st.—“One circumstance out of many which have resulted from our Missionary services is this. Amongst those who received the Holy Communion the last time it was administered at the Parish Church, I had the great privilege of seeing twenty-one of my own people present, several of

whom had never before approached that sacred ordinance. In my visitations I have found people most kind, and willing to receive our ministrations ; and even amongst the Dissenters I have perceived the utmost good will evinced towards us."

What more need I say ? I do but put together expressions in the Reports when I tell of pastoral visits welcomed ; of schools established ; of school sites freely given by owners of property who see the earnest work which is going on ; of services held, which are remarkable for heartiness and united worship ; of candidates for confirmation, from amongst the workers at a manufactory, presenting the curate with a silver inkstand and pencil, as an evidence of the value they put upon his instruction ; of a beautiful Church with accommodation for 600 and upwards, lately consecrated.

With facts like these I am in a position to speak boldly before you, and thankfully before God, of good results both from Congresses, and from the particular species of parochial organization which I advocate. Why should not the experiment be carried out on a yet larger scale ? If once the object of compassing the whole population were contemplated as a *reality* which might possibly be attained, such is my confidence in the sound-hearted attachment both of rich and poor to the Church of their fathers, notwithstanding seeming alienations, that I feel sure sufficient funds would be forthcoming to make the parochial system a living power, and so relieve the overburdened clergyman from the painful consciousness of never being able to overtake his work.

I have said nothing of *Diocesan* organization ; and all I mean to say is this, that as in the case of a large parish there can be no effective parochial organization without adding very largely to the number of the clergy, so without adding to the number of bishops, whether as suffragans or as coadjutors in our large dioceses, or with independent sees, there can be through the length and breadth of the land no effective diocesan organization.

I hope it will not be deemed out of place if I add a few inferences from the facts and statements which have been laid before you.

1. In the first place, then, this is a work which should not be left to the sole responsibility of clergymen either in inaugurating or in carrying out. It should be considered that the clergyman has a limited income with no such means of increasing it as trade or as some other professions afford. Every true Christian has a concern in this work being done, every true Churchman in its being done decently and in order. So many qualifications are required for its being efficiently done, that it is only when each member of the body is in its proper place and discharging its proper functions, that it can be possible. Business habits and learned leisure, pecuniary liberality and active labour, the wisdom of the aged and the zeal of the young, may all be combined in a healthy circulation of spiritual energy, and in active co-operation for the common good. But do not make the clergyman responsible for not doing that which he can often only suggest, and which he certainly cannot do without the cheerful co-operation of his people, and specially of those who are communicants.

2. Again, this is a work in which there should be no backwardness or want of zeal in the clergyman, and no jealousy of the active co-

operation of the laity. Want of zeal is like the "ointment of the right hand which bewrayeth itself," and would certainly paralyse the efforts whether of assistant clergy, or of lay helpers. And as to jealousy of the laity, it is always a mistake—in this work it would be a sin. It has been said that the rulers of the Church have determined to sanction the employment of laymen subordinate even to the Diaconate, who shall be authorised by the Bishop himself to assist, not only in private ministrations of Christian love, but in conducting public services where the necessities of the people call for them. I for one hail this determination with thankfulness. It will enable some anxious clergymen to carry on means of instruction, which they cannot carry on at present for lack of suitable curates. It will preserve in the service of the Church many who in times past would have been urged by what they deemed a conscious call to be useful, and it might be by misdirected zeal, to join a non-conforming community, because not allowed in our own. It will enable the clergyman to utilize much power that is now unused. I deprecate the hard judgment of the laity when, because Church work is not done, they say it is entirely the fault of the clergyman. But I deprecate also the hasty conclusion of the clergyman who, expecting all his parishioners to be what they ought to be, neglects to make them useful as they are.

The provision of authorized helpers will tend greatly to the extension of daily services for the poor in our parishes. Who shall object to this, who yet values prayer? It may be that there is a danger of formalism being generated. But this is an abuse to be guarded against. On the other hand, when the services are properly conducted the abundance of precious thoughts often suggested by the Lessons of the day, so applicable to every circumstance of daily duty and trial, and the holy sweet calm produced by joining in the prayers and praises of the whole Church, are advantages which cannot be over-estimated. Where *oratories, i. e.,* prayerhouses, or *chapels*, are scattered over a parish, a duly authorized Reader in the absence of a clergyman may conduct a short service every evening—say of half-an-hour's duration—ten minutes of which may be occupied in enforcing some practical lesson drawn from Holy Scripture in such a manner as the clergyman might suggest and arrange. Many of our poor who have *no opportunity of family worship in their own houses* would be glad of these opportunities; and by choosing an hour most convenient to those resident near the oratory, it might be, that in a given parish, besides the daily worship in the parish church, three or four other assemblies might be daily gathered, and so knit together in the one communion and fellowship of the Church.

My testimony is well nigh given. But on one or two further points of interest I would say a word.

Differences of opinion and angry feelings, alas! are sometimes excited with reference to plans for parochial organization, when the question is raised as to what is the proper mode of dealing with those, by whatever name called, who are not members of the Church. In my view then, it should be such as to extend to them spiritual ministrations or Christian education whenever occasion calls or opportunity offers. Many have been driven to occupy their present position by the past unfaithfulness of pastors of the Church. Many

occupy it because they have been trained by parents who were so driven, and can give no better reason than some Churchmen give for being Churchmen—namely that they have always been used to it. Amongst them are to be found men of exalted piety and Christian consistency, whose example at least we might well follow, and who hold dear as life the great truths which tend to the exaltation of our Lord and Master. I cannot deliver such as these to uncovenanted mercies; or charge them with deadly sin for that which may be more their misfortune than their fault; or wish to forbid them to cast out the spirits of ignorance, superstition, and vice, because they follow not us. But on the other hand, I cannot act as a parochial minister so as to countenance those of our people who think it does not matter where they go, nor can I so fraternize as to lose sight of important principles of truth and order. But it will be generally found that we have enough to do, when we determine to allow no question whatever to distract our attention from ministering to those who are willing to receive us, and thus attract those who differ by shewing them a more excellent way.

My last words must needs be solemn. Our harvest field has gone to waste, because we have not had sufficient hands to gather it in. Or, it may be, because the reapers were discouraged at the extent and seeming hopelessness of the task. Or because they were so occupied as sowers that they never expected to be reapers. But we may well be thankful that the duty of gathering in the whole harvest is now more generally and practically recognised. Witness the noble scheme of my own Diocesan, whose health may it please God to re-establish, and whose life may it please God to prolong, that he may be able to finish what it has been put into his heart to attempt!

But one danger remains. The machinery may be perfected and yet we may want the motive power and the trusty hands that may guide it aright. The Lord of the harvest alone can send the right kind of labourers in sufficient numbers, whether Bishops, Priests, or Deacons, or Lay-helpers, which the exigencies of the times demand. What a need then is there of united prayer, and of special effort that our Ember Weeks especially may be seasons of believing and earnest supplication!

Let us not be high-minded, but fear. Let us beware of Church pride. We have suffered the wall of our Zion to be broken down. Let us arise as one man and build. There remaineth yet much land to be possessed. And while this is so—while any work remains to be done—let us not boast of our machinery for doing it, but thankfully and prayerfully make use of it. For what—we may solemnly ask ourselves—are we doing in our parishes at home for the manifestation of that precious truth which, as a Reformed, a Scriptural, and Protestant branch of the holy Catholic Church, we have had committed to our trust? What are we doing for its extension amongst the Heathen? How many of our Parishes have Missionary Associations? And, after all, even though there were a shaking in the valley of our vision, and bone came to his bone, and sinews and flesh came upon them, and the skin covered them from above, we should still have need to pray—"Come from the four winds, O breath, and breathe upon these slain that they may live!" Much indeed

is required of us that we may be able with consistency and sincerity to say, in the language of a noble Christian Soldier of our Church—now entered into his rest—"I THANK GOD THAT I AM A CHRISTIAN. I THANK HIM ALSO THAT I AM A CHURCHMAN."

DISCUSSION.

THE REV. PREBENDARY MACKARNESS: In an assembly where the speakers have their very existence numbered by minutes, some things must be taken for granted, rather than proved. I shall take it for granted as a general principle that a good army may be defeated for want of officers, and that the best cause may be lost if its friends do not understand how to turn their resources to good account. *Our* army is the National Church; and, if I were going to traverse the whole field of the subject laid down in the programme, I should endeavour in the first place to show that it has not general officers enough. I should contend that without an increase of them its diocesan organization cannot be complete. And I should have to show that all other improvements depend in some measure on this essential reform. But I have not time for this nor for an inquiry into the cognate subject of Capitular service. Taking our ecclesiastical army as it is—with this great deficiency of superintendence—do we make the best use of its officers in a lower grade? Here, again, if I were going to deal with the whole subject, I should have to point out that our forces are disposed with an entire want of military skill. We put the same pastoral strength into a parish of 200 or 300 people which we expend on a population numbering 5,000 or 6,000 souls. We send a man with a weak voice to a large church—a learned divine to an uneducated flock—a half-trained preacher to a congregation which could appreciate and profit by high culture in its minister; in short, we make no attempt to suit our officers to their work. Again, however, I find myself touching on a subject too large for our limits to-day: I should be glad to see the whole question of Church patronage discussed in some future Congress, as it deserves to be, in a Section by itself. Taking things as they are, then, in this respect also, I ask again whether our organization is complete. If it were so, some arrangements, which are now altogether exceptional, would be universal. Every Ruridecanal Chapter would be in working order, regularly attended by the whole body of clergy in the deanery. All matters affecting the Church in its local efficiency would here be considered—support of missions, inspection of schools, meetings of choirs, arrangement of special services and sermons, besides those questions of diocesan or general interest which might from time to time be propounded by the Bishop for discussion. These Chapters would all report to a Conference of Rural Deans or other central body, of course presided over by the Bishop himself. The pulsations of ecclesiastical life would beat quickly and regularly throughout the whole frame of the spiritual body. Of Visitations I will only say that they might be very different from what they are in most dioceses,—more useful, perhaps, than they are even in the best. Thus far as to dioceses: is our organization better as between parish and parish? A young layman, who has been carefully trained and in constant enjoyment of spiritual privileges under pastoral care and kindness from childhood, changes his abode,—perhaps to lose everything he has hitherto profited by, or, under more favourable circumstances, to remain personally unknown by his new pastor until chance brings them acquainted. Some simple system of letters commendatory in such cases is surely an obvious part of any proper organization of the Church. But come down to the separate unity of parochial life—in many respects the most important of all—how do things stand here? Not quite, I venture to think, as they ought. Parochial work is not systematised; responsibility is not brought home in detail to those who have it in charge. I have heard one of the most excellent and eminent laymen of our time say that the clergy seemed to him to be the only profession never tied by professional engagements. Of Sundays, of course, he was not speaking. As far as week-days are concerned, his remark has perhaps more truth in it than one could wish. Pastoral visitation of the sick must, of course, by the nature of the case, be somewhat irregular: the other details of parochial duty need not be so variable as in practice for the most part they are. Meetings of district visitors and of Sunday-school teachers, Bible classes, choir-practices, gatherings of young communicants,

preparation for confirmation, whether of individuals or classes,—these and other like duties ought surely to be done on a system, and the obligation to do them should constitute a professional engagement as binding as other professional engagements are. This regularity would generate a habit of accuracy of detail in work, which would admit of being measured and recorded as other work is. At present we have scarcely any parochial statistics worthy of the name. How many parishes there are in which there is not even a list of the communicants, much less a record of the number of communions they have made; many in which the fact or the date of a particular person's confirmation could not be traced; yet more, in which there would be nothing known of the after history of those who have been confirmed. Yet it cannot be justly said that pastoral work is by its nature incompatible with system in its performance or with accuracy in its records. How easily we fall into statistical method when the law steps in to require it, as in the case of baptisms, burials, and marriages! Why should Confirmations be less carefully set down? A clergyman who takes office as one of her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools is obliged to set down his employment of every day for the satisfaction of my Lords. Such of us as have been chaplains to our union work-houses know that we must enter every service and every visit in the chaplain's report. Nor is there any reason why the work of a parish should not be tabulated with equal fidelity. Its results could then be submitted to the Diocesan for his information as to the success of the Church's ministrations; and, as to some points, for statistical records of matters generally interesting and important to the Church. In America the Bishops think it no way derogatory to their office to report their discharge of episcopal duty in detail to the Conventions over which they preside. It is said, I know, that statistical method and official routine are not consistent with spiritual life. Why not? Is military discipline inconsistent with courage, loyalty, or self-sacrifice? Is a fire brigade less daring in the hour of its perilous service, because every man has his exact duty and his appointed place? The truth is, that we are wasting a great deal of power, for want of knowing how to use it aright. A young clergyman enters not unfrequently on a sole charge without any idea of the way in which his pastoral services ought to be bestowed. Years of tentative experiment pass by before he has found out the plans by which he may most easily maintain cordial relations with the right-minded of his flock, or win back those who have been estranged. Too often, having begun without system, he learns to think that no system is required, and falls back on the mere performance of what used to be called "surplice duty" on occasions when it is of necessity required. Where little is asked for, still less than that little is apt to be done. The want of vitality which in some parts of England is commonly deplored, especially in country parishes, may be traced to the want of a sufficient standard of work. We may have a high average of morality, respectability, and social propriety: but these things do not make up for want of definite professional work. It is true that habits of order, diligence, and obedience are not inseparably connected with that love for Christ and His little ones which is essential to all pastoral success. With or without system, the unbelieving, unloving pastor will fail. All I have contended is, that good organization will make failure less conspicuous,—will multiply success a hundred-fold.

The Rev. DR. WILKINSON: The subjects of this morning's discussion have already been so ably treated that it seems scarcely necessary to detain you with any additional remarks. I will, however, try to avoid traversing the ground that has been so well gone over by the preceding speakers. I will only say with regard to the first point, that though one of the invited speakers, I feel some difficulty from the way in which Diocesan organization has been presented to my mind; because, I think it might be said that if we were to venture to discuss such a subject and pretend to give our opinions upon it, we should be like some elderly bachelors or spinsters of mature age who are fond of discussing the questions of parental duties, the ordering of families, and the bringing up of children. When it does so happen that these persons are advanced to the dignity of parentage, they generally find that their fine-spun theories do not work, that their children are no better than other people's, and that their families are no better managed. Therefore, I feel very thankful that it is not necessary for me to touch the question of Diocesan Organization. The subject has been ably treated by one who is not a bishop, but who seems from his knowledge well qualified to be a bishop. As to Parochial organization, I may be supposed to have some experience of that; and I concur most fully with my excellent friend Mr. Cadman and the gentleman who followed him. I know that it is necessary to speak with caution on such a subject as this, and that one kind of organization will by no means suit all parishes. There was an able paper read on the subject of the

Lord's Day in which there was much that was admirable, and in which there was one practical recommendation with regard to the way of meeting the wants and necessities of our poorer brethren in large towns. It was suggested that early services and early celebrations of the Holy Communion would meet the necessities of their case; and that later services would meet the necessities of their richer fellow parishioners. Now, I am bound to say that my experience convinces me that our working-classes will not come to very early services, and therefore if we are to meet their habits I am sure it must be by late services. Nay, I will go further and say, what many will disapprove of, that it must be rather by evening than by early communions. While on this subject I will take the liberty of suggesting that whatever may be the short-comings of our church with respect to the celebration of the Holy Communion, either generally or locally, she is not to be charged with the sin with which the Church of Rome may justly be charged,—the Church of Rome which, alas! was held up to us as a model in this respect by one speaker!—inasmuch as the Church of Rome withholds the Communion in its fulness by withdrawing the cup from the Laity.

ARCHDEACON CHURTON: I beg to call the speaker to order. I do not think it is regular to allude to speakers in another section.

DR. WILKINSON: I will gladly bow to the chair.

LORD FEVERSHAM: I think it would be better not to allude to what has taken place elsewhere.

DR. WILKINSON: I gladly bow to the suggestion of the noble chairman. A deep sense of the responsibility which rests upon him should stir up every clergyman to organize his parish in the best possible manner for advancing the work of God within its limits, and for spreading the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour throughout the length and breadth of the world. I am sure that that deep sense of responsibility must be felt by him if he considers the work that has been committed to him, the solemnity of the charge which he has received, the ruin and wretchedness resulting from the Fall, for which the Gospel is the only effectual remedy; the minister of the parish, I say, must feel it his bounden duty, and must feel personally stimulated to adopt that course which seems most likely to combat error of doctrine or ungodliness of life. I do not think, however, that it is wise in the clergy because a particular plan has succeeded in one parish, forthwith to introduce it into another. Circumstances differ, and men differ; and because a thing answers in one place it by no means follows that it will answer elsewhere. It appears to me that our organization should be as simple as is consistent with efficiency. Our parochial organization is sometimes so complex—there is so much of arrangement about it—that a man seems to have nothing to do but to go over it, and either to admire it himself, or to celebrate its praise to those with whom he may come in contact. This is a danger to which we are exposed and against which we should be on our guard. We should leave as much as possible, and far as it is consistent with order, to the independent action of the laymen who are associated with us. In the able paper which was read to us allusions were made to the relationship between the bishop and his clergy. Do we not feel that there is a paternal care and fatherly watchfulness which belongs to the bishop, but that ought not and need not interfere with the responsibilities or the rights of the parochial clergy? As it is with the relationship between the bishop and the parson, so it ought to be with those between the parson and the lay helpers who are associated with him. They may not be ready to fall into all his plans; let him therefore be content with a general superintendence. While he can utilize the materials placed at his disposal, let him lean as much as possible to the Christian feelings of his people. He should regard our parochial machinery not as set in motion by fuel supplied by a man, but as a great water wheel set in motion by the river which proceeds from the Throne of God—a living power that will act without straining or breaking the machine, but that will maintain and strengthen it. May we therefore, as ministers of God, constantly endeavour by our prayers to bring the streams of grace, which he is ever ready to pour upon us, to bear upon our machinery, and then all will be for God's glory and for man's benefit!

THE EARL OF HARROWBY: I feel that perhaps my special duty here is to speak as a layman. After so many able and useful addresses from those who are more closely concerned in the administration of parochial and diocesan duties, I should be unworthy of my position as a layman interested in the affairs of the church, if I did not express my own views and state the impressions which have been left upon my mind. Two distinct questions have been raised, though I am not quite sure they are after all very distinct—Diocesan and Parochial Organization. There is of course a natural con-

nexion between the two. As for Diocesan organization I can truly say that for the last twenty years or more—in fact ever since I have been able to think at all upon the matter—I have entertained not the slightest possible doubt that our episcopal administration ought to be strengthened. It appears to me to be a great absurdity to call ourselves an Episcopal Church, while our episcopal system is so extremely weak. It is absurd that our system of supervision should not be strengthened, considering the increase which has taken place in the number of the population. How that is to be attained, whether by the subdivision of dioceses or by suffragans, I do not pretend to say. My own views would require both. We ought to have a subdivision of dioceses throughout the kingdom—we ought to break up our dioceses into an additional number. My own wish would be that every county should be a diocese, and that our civil and ecclesiastical jurisdictions should where it is possible coincide. I admit that there might be difficulties in that plan. Therefore I do not say we should have any strict rule, but we ought either to divide or to have suffragans. I do not see how you can give suffragans all the weight which belongs to diocesan bishops, any more than you can give to curates the weight and authority which the minister of the parish exercises; at the same time, we all know what assistance curates can be to the minister of a parish, and why should not bishops have their curates for the purpose of executing those duties which may be called the more mechanical ones of their office? such as the consecration of churches and churchyards, confirmations, and things of that kind, which do not want the weight and authority of the superior, ruling bishop of the diocese, but which can be discharged by a person deputed by him and discharging his functions. There cannot be a stronger case than the diocese of London. Any Bishop of London that attempts to discharge his duties efficiently must break down, and yet one would be sorry to see the diocese materially reduced, so that there should no longer be a Bishop of London. But why should there not be four or five suffragans under him, acting under his authority and discharging a vast amount of those more mechanical duties, as I called them, which press so heavily upon him, leaving to him the general administration of the see, and enabling him to come in, as it were the *deus ex machina*, upon every occasion which seemed to call for his personal interference? With regard to the general question of appointing suffragans, there is this convenience in adopting that mode of relieving the Episcopal Bench—it would require no fresh legislation; you would only have to put into activity powers which already exist. I believe that the first bishop that should avail himself of the law would be generally supported by the public opinion of this country. With regard to Parochial Organization, the functions of the laity have been very largely commented upon, and it is a great satisfaction to me to see the extent to which the principle of lay help is recognized. It is only a specimen of the manner in which seed once sown will retain its vitality. It is now twenty years since a number of private gentlemen (Mr. Gladstone I believe was one of them) suggested that laymen should be employed to assist the clergy in the service of the Church. That suggestion was at the moment before its time; apparently it fell to the ground, but the germ of that idea has been gradually developing, and now it has borne ripened fruit. In the diocese of Gloucester, I believe three or four laymen have been appointed by the authority of the Bishop to assist the clergy to the full extent to which they are able. Our great difficulty, as Mr. Mackarness has pointed out, is how to put the right men into the right places. That is a very great difficulty, and it is not confined to ecclesiastical administration. In civil affairs, however, if the right man does not get into the right place—if those who appoint him make a mistake as to his fitness, or act from corrupt motives—we know where to look for a remedy; but in ecclesiastical affairs there is no remedy at all. If the patronage of the Church were confined exclusively to its governors, you might hold them responsible; but with patronage distributed amongst bishops, chapters, corporations, private men, and private women, how are you to secure that the right man shall be put into the right place? It is a question of extreme difficulty, and, as I said, I know not where to look for a remedy. Again there is no proportion between the work and the remuneration; in fact work and remuneration are generally in inverse ratio. Your agricultural benefices are often very highly and superfluously endowed, whereas your large parishes are as often very meanly endowed indeed. What security have you that you will be able to put an able man into an important position, when the income attached to by it is such that he can hardly maintain his wife and children upon it, and rear his sons to follow in their father's steps? Such is the difficulty which must belong to any system where the patronage is dispersed in many hands. There is but one

remedy that I can see, and that I am afraid will appear a very strong suggestion; namely, that there shall be, as in the Scotch Church, a reasoned veto in the congregation—not that the congregation shall be able to say, “We don’t like the man, and therefore will not have him;” but that they should be able to say, “The man is disqualified for such and such reason, physical or moral, and therefore we disapprove of his appointment, and ask to be allowed to prove the grounds of our objection.”

The Rev. W. J. BEAMONT: I wish to say a few words on the best mode of supplementing the Ecclesiastical agency of a parish where it is found to be deficient. It appears to me that we should for that purpose do well to avail ourselves of the machinery we have already got. The first step, then, is for a clergyman to call his vestry together and to ask them for assistance. I believe that in very few instances where the clergyman is really doing his work would that assistance be refused. I believe that if the wants of the parish were plainly put before the people, they would not withhold either their personal aid or their money. But there are parishes where this aid might not be possible; and the thing next to be done in that case is to avail ourselves of the organization of the rural deaneries. Each rural deanery should have a meeting of the clergy, of the churchwardens, and, if necessary, of other representatives of the laity; and, if we would only move them to make the spiritual agency of the deanery commensurate with its wants, much might be done. The experiment has been tried at Cambridge. The plan was proposed to the clergy and churchwardens of the rural deanery; these promised the incumbent of the two largest parishes to help him in providing two additional curates; and funds for these two curates were guaranteed, so that now the parish which has a population of 10,000 inhabitants has a clergyman for every 2,000 persons. A similar step has been taken with regard to a parish adjoining; and one of the Colleges gives £50 a year towards the expense. Such are the effects of appealing to local assistance. A person who has a cesspool close to his own door cannot help seeing the scandal, and he will be disposed to give even a large sum to have it abated. This plan which I am recommending is of universal application. If the wants of the rural deanery are large, there is a necessity for largely increasing the number of its clergy and *vice versa*. In the deanery there are poor parishes and rich parishes; and these latter may be asked to have a weekly offertory towards relieving the wants of their less fortunate neighbours. It is clearly contemplated by our Church that the clergy should be maintained or assisted by the offertory, and I know no mode more legitimate for relieving the spiritual wants of the poorer districts. As to Diocesan Organization, it is clear that the number of our bishops requires increasing. I think, with Lord Harrowby, that it would be very desirable to adopt both the plans suggested; and there is one method that, I think, might be tried with success. In the year 1855, the Cathedral Commissioners pointed out in their report twelve dioceses which required subdivision, and I don’t see why we should be satisfied with a less amount of subdivision than that. This subject was mooted at our Church Congress at Cambridge, and it was then agreed that there ought to be both an increase of Sees, and the introduction of suffragans or coadjutor bishops. I would suggest that everyone who feels an interest in the subject should consent to act upon a committee, and that he should with that view at once communicate his name to the Secretary of the Church Institute. Let every one be willing to pay a subscription of 5s. a year, and let the Church Institute appeal to the rural deaneries for assistance in organizing a deputation to press the matter upon the Government and upon members of the House of Commons. If that were done, we might collect such an expression of public opinion as no Government could possibly resist. Then comes the further question, How are these additional bishops to be maintained? But here also I would apply the same principle of appealing to local support. Take Liverpool for instance. It seems to me that if it were proposed to constitute a bishopric of Liverpool, and the people of Liverpool felt that they might have a bishop if they would find the means to maintain him, there would be no difficulty in providing the necessary funds. At all events, if the inhabitants were not willing to contribute, I should say, they must do without their bishop. Let there be a permissive bill to establish in those places which have been recommended by the Committees, new Sees as soon as an endowment has been provided, and I think there would be no difficulty on that score.

The Rev. GEORGE LEWTHWAITE: “Organization”—this is one of the great wants of our Church at the present day; therefore, I think the Committee have done well to place the subject upon their programme. “Diocesan and Parochial” Organization I suppose are intended to cover the whole field of Church Organization; but besides the question upon which a most excellent paper was read by Mr. Cadman, and besides

those matters of Diocesan concerns which another speaker has admonished us had best be left to the Episcopal mind, there are many other points which come within our subject, and which are most important. If it is not true to say that the organization of the Church, as a systematic organization, has been at a standstill since the Reformation, it cannot be said that our present parochial extension is systematically conducted. If, for example, any one takes up the *Clergy List*, and looks down its columns, what will he find there? Can any thoughtful mind help being struck by the mode in which our parishes are arranged? There is the large parish and then a great number of other parishes some of which have been formed by the aid of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, and which are arranged as subordinate to the original parish. But then we find that there is also an arrangement of district parishes, subordinate to these subordinate parishes. Such was not the method of parochial-subdivision in earlier times—then the new parishes became wholly distinct, each Church even having the title of its own district. Now, is not the time come, and is it not the proper work of this Association, to consider the entire question of our ecclesiastical organization? Again, does not the subdivision of the older parishes—which let me observe is a very advantageous measure—render it still more needful to restore the unity of the body, and to provide for the great social duties which that unity fulfilled? Formerly, though it was a great anomaly that one parish priest should preside over a multitude of souls fully equal to a reasonable diocese, yet that circumstance did keep up a corporate unity amongst the people and brought to bear the wealth of the town for the relief of the poorer districts. But now many parishes which are separated from the original parish are composed entirely of the poor, and the rich do not feel the same responsibility concerning what is now another parish, as they used to do when it formed a part of their own. Does it not require that the united action of the Church should be restored by the establishment of a chief minister in every such case? Allow me to remind you that this is no new idea. It was expressed by the great and respected teacher of my early years. Dr. Arnold said three and thirty years ago, “In order to an efficient and comprehensive Church reform, the first thing is to divide our actual dioceses. Every large town should necessarily be the seat of a bishop; but the bishop thus created need have no seat in Parliament. The present dioceses might then become Provinces; and the only change that need be made would be in the name of the clergyman appointed—instead of being the minister of one parish he would become bishop of the diocese.” May we not ask then if the time has not come to consider whether the Church of England at home has not attained such proportions that her hierarchy may be developed into Archbishops, Metropolitans, and Diocesan Bishops? I would give seats in Parliament only to the existing Sees, but under the bishops of those Sees I would establish suffragans, at first as simply assistant bishops to the present diocesan; and I would place these suffragans in large towns, just as missionary priests are sent to organize missionary districts which presently become parishes. You need not apply to Parliament at all. I would place one of these suffragans say at Leeds, with the understanding that he should not be used as coadjutor bishop throughout the whole diocese—[The rev. was stopped by the time bell.]

ARCHDEACON EMERY: There was a point touched upon by Mr. Cadman that induced me to send up my name. He mentioned the fact that at a former Congress he brought forward a certain scheme for providing for the spiritual destitution of the country; that that scheme had been put in operation for the space of five years; and that the results of it had been most satisfactory. The idea is this—that there should be one clergyman for every 2,000 or 2,500 souls. In 1863, an important deputation waited upon the whole Bench of Bishops, who were in session in Dean's Yard, at Westminster. I will just mention the institutions that were represented, and you will then see that the scheme propounded was really worthy of consideration. There was the Church Institution, which was originated and established by the lamented Henry Hoare. There was the Committee of Laymen, which was originated by the equally lamented John Knott. There was the Churchwardens' Association, another society originated by Henry Hoare; and there was, lastly, the Cambridge Church Defence Association. The scheme was that throughout the length and breadth of the land statistics should be got together, and that an effort should be made by means of local contributions, aided by general funds, to supply the more pressing wants of the Church. The rural deans were each asked to say how many extra clergy were required in his deanery to supply one for every 2,000 or 2,500 persons, and then to say whether it would not be possible, by going to the chief proprietors in the district, to get something towards the necessary funds? This scheme was approved of; a trial of it has

been made; and it has succeeded. The Additional Curates Society—(all praise to it!) took up the proposal and assisted us to start it at Cambridge, where we have now the full number of clergymen, supported by funds raised on the spot, and with very little extra assistance. At Warrington the laity and clergy came to a resolution that they should want five additional clergymen. They went to the Additional Curates Society, who said, "We will give so much if you will raise the remainder, so that each of your clergymen may have £120 a year." In a very few weeks money was subscribed to try the experiment for five years. At St. Helen's, the same process has been gone through. At Runcorn it has also been done. It has become an established fact that if the system were carried throughout the length and breadth of the land, as urged by the deputation, in a very short time we should arrive at a very satisfactory result, and should bring out an immense amount of local assistance so as to provide for the necessities of the country. The Archbishop of Canterbury very kindly received the deputation, and he has since assisted the scheme by his advice and encouragement. He was good enough before delivering his last charge to write to ask how the plan had succeeded, and, having received information, he has publicly expressed his wish that it should, if possible, be carried out through the country at large. Two years ago, I was asked to read a paper on Ruri-decanal Administration, at the Church Congress; and I ventured to circulate that paper and ask for information. I was overwhelmed with answers. In fact it nearly broke down my health to tabulate and consider the result, and that result appeared to be that the ruri-decanal system existed in theory, but that it could not get into perfect action unless you gave the rural deaneries some practical question, like this of providing for the Church's wants, which would make them look into the resources of the district, and make them develop those resources to the utmost of their power. We have heard a great deal from Mr. Mackarness about having a more systematic mode of working our parishes. The fact is we have not got good parish work because we have no training for our clergy. Our Universities do not train our clergy, and therefore I do not understand how we are to attain to a good system of parochial work. One very important matter has been referred to by the Earl of Harrowby, namely, how are you to get the right man into the right place? I do think that is a most difficult question, but I venture to put before you a suggestion made by an archdeacon who, a hundred years ago, revived to a great extent, Ecclesiastical Law. It was that the bishop should not act alone, but should have a council of laity and clergy to advise him. The bishop would then be able to say to the patron, "You have recommended to me a man for this parish, but it is our duty, and my especial duty, to see that besides holding your recommendation, he is really fit for the office." The bishop and his council would then declare in the face of the public whether the nominee was or was not fit for the benefice.

MR. RUTSON: After the speeches which you have heard, I come before you rather in the character of a witness. I feel particularly indebted to the Earl of Harrowby for what has fallen from him, but I wish to say a few words as representing the agricultural interest, for we have hitherto heard chiefly of large towns and manufacturing districts. In my neighbourhood there is a parish, a vicarage, in which the church and parsonage are at one extremity, and in which there are two large villages, one two and the other three miles distant. At the former there is a church, but for many years service has only been performed in it once a month. In the latter, there is no church and no performance of Divine Worship, but there are the remains of a church in which some aged persons can remember service being said. I could tell you the effects of this state of things from my personal observation; but I think there should be some Court of Appeal in such cases. In the country, a young man of 24 is turned loose in a parish, and whatever his fitness or otherwise, there he remains. We, in agricultural districts, can tell you the great evil of this; for in the country public opinion is not brought to bear upon clerical mismanagement as it is in towns. The Squire does not want to be at variance with his clergyman; the churchwardens do not do their duty—do they know it?—and so the mischief goes on. I admire the exertions which have been made to supply the wants of some parishes, but the state of the parish to which I have referred has outlived three archbishops. Surely, there ought to be some means of providing a remedy. You all know that there are a large number of livings in the hands of the Lord Chancellor, and that the late Lord Chancellor showed a disposition to alienate them. If these livings were amalgamated they would produce an average income of £250 each. Let the possession of one of these be assured to such young men as for seven or eight years do their duty as Curates in populous places in any earnest manner to the satisfaction of the Bishop. At present

these livings are given away without much knowledge on the part of the Lord Chancellor of those on whom he bestows them; but by adopting the plan I have suggested, there would be some guarantee that the clergyman appointed had gone through a proper amount of training, and was fit for the situation. If the experiment succeeded, it might be a matter for consideration whether even in the case of private patronage there ought not to be some kind of ordeal to be gone through, before a young man at the age of 25 was made the arbiter, in spiritual matters, of a whole parish.

ARCHDEACON HAMILTON: This Congress should not separate without reference to a very important body of persons whose duty seems, to a great extent, to have fallen into abeyance—I mean Sponsors. We have no column in our baptismal registers for sponsors, and therefore we do not know where in our parishes to find them. If they signed the register when the child was baptised, we should have some opportunity of looking after them; as it is, we see them once in the vestry, and then we see them no more. It is the more important to attend to this matter, because the duty of sponsors does not immediately come into action. If the law requires alteration in order to carry out my suggestion, I think the sooner that alteration is made the better. There is another class of officers from whom the Church does not receive half the work they would willingly give, I refer to Churchwardens. Do we always select the best men? The clergy have the power to nominate half the churchwardens in the country—Do we always select them from amongst the communicants, and do we give them charge over those secular matters which might properly be placed in their hands? If they are communicants, might they not be asked to act as lay-assistants among the people of their own homesteads? I think, too, that the Bishops and Archdeacons are much to blame for the manner in which they treat the churchwardens when they hold their visitations. Churchwardens are often sworn in by some unknown person during the time of Divine Service, and very little is addressed to them in the charge. They come into the vestry, make certain declarations, pay certain fees, and then go about their business. I think that their duties ought to be pointed out to them in the charge, and that their office is not sufficiently magnified by the bishops, archdeacons, and clergy. A great deal has been said about the subdivision of Parishes; but so far, it has been only sub-division for clerical duties which has been spoken of. When you have subdivided your parish into districts containing 2,000 souls under one clergyman, you ought again to subdivide each into smaller districts for the purpose of visiting. The district visitors should have each twenty families, and no more; and they should be obliged by the rules of the society into which they have voluntarily entered to see each family once a fortnight; and to deliver to each a tract, to be selected by the clergyman. The object of that tract is both to disseminate information and to place in the hands of our visitors (without any prying into the domestic matters of the family) an opportunity of becoming the friend of each family. It is an easy introduction, and will enable the visitors to ask about the children, to enquire why they are absent from the Sunday school, and to become generally acquainted with the circumstances of the household. My parish is 45 miles in its boundaries, and I have established in it such a system as I have described. The farmers' wives have been asked to be district visitors for their own homesteads, and they have seldom or never refused. In some places the population is so scattered that the only way to deal with it is to place a curate who can ride a light weight and a good active pony! If this were done, and the curate visited each section of the parish in its turn, a great many people would be saved from becoming practically "pagans"—that is to say "country folk"—who now fall into that condition for the want of clerical visitation. With respect to the licensing of laymen by the bishop, it is the opinion of the clergy of the Archdeaconry of Lindisfarne that the proposed plan would be rather a dangerous innovation; because when once the bishop has licensed a man, the bishop only can take his license away; and it would seriously affect the man's character were his license so withdrawn. It is, therefore, almost the universal opinion of the clergy in the Archdeaconry of Lindisfarne that these licenses should not be given. Under Lord Shaftesbury's Act, we have power to employ the laity for the performance of all those parts of Divine Service which laymen can properly perform; and when we like we can withdraw our permission without in the least impeaching the character of those so employed. As to Patronage, there is one great practical difficulty which might be removed. There is at present no mode of providing a retirement for very aged or infirm clergymen. There are old gentlemen who cannot leave their rooms, and, however admirable they may be, they can do nothing for their parishes. I would suggest that we should adopt the Scotch

system, and allow patrons to appoint a successor with half the stipend. It would be a great relief not only to the parish but to the conscience of the infirm clergyman himself, if he could retire with half the income of the benefice for his life.

The DEAN of ELY: It was not my intention to address the meeting this morning, as I am to be the first reader of a paper at the afternoon sitting in this room. But my friend Archdeacon Emery has requested me to say one or two words upon the practical experience which we have had in the diocese of Ely with regard to this matter of Diocesan Organization; and if it can be shown that the experiment we have tried has answered with us, and that there is a reasonable hope that it will be found to answer elsewhere, it may be useful that the results of that experiment should be recorded here. Now, our Bishop has made his experiment on Diocesan Organization in this way. He has endeavoured to organize, or rather he has succeeded in organizing Ruridecanal action. That action consists of two parts. The clergy meet by themselves, and when they do that they style themselves, as they have a right to do, a "Ruridecanal Chapter." But then in addition to this Ruridecanal Chapter, we have another gathering in which there is a lay element, and for the sake of distinction we have called that a "Ruridecanal Meeting." The laity present at our Ruridecanal meetings are the churchwardens of parishes *ex officio*, and such other laymen as the clergy and churchwardens together think it desirable to invite. We have thus a council consisting of clergy and of any useful, hard-working, clear-headed laymen of whose assistance it may be thought well to avail ourselves. The next thing to be done is to bring these meetings immediately into connection with the Bishop; and for that purpose the Bishop has called together Diocesan Conferences. These also divide themselves into two classes nearly analogous to the Ruridecanal Chapters and the Ruridecanal Meetings—we have one meeting consisting exclusively of clerical members, and the next day we have a mixed conference of clergy and laymen. At these Diocesan Conferences we have before us reports from the different Ruridecanal Chapters and Meetings on certain subjects which have been put forward for discussion at them; so that in this way we have before us the mind of the clergy and laity of the diocese by representation. The only Conferences upon this plan that we have yet had took place in the course of the present year; and therefore the experiment is young. We have had several Clerical Conferences; but the Bishop did not arrive at combining the clerical and lay elements till this year. It must, however, be remembered that our Bishop has only been our Bishop for three or four years, and therefore he has not been long at reaching this result. Nothing in the world could be more satisfactory than our meeting; and it was more especially satisfactory from the way in which it brought to light the cordial feeling of co-operation that existed between the clergy and laity in regard to whatever concerned the interests of the diocese. If there was ever any fear that the clergy would be overridden by their lay brethren the experiment we have made would banish any such fear for ever. If I had any fault to find with the laymen at all, it was that they were too modest, too deferential, and not sufficiently ready to put forward schemes for themselves. I had intended to fire a shot at my Lord Harrowby, but as he has run away I won't. What I intended to do if he were present was merely to ask him to retract or explain one word that he used. Speaking of the Consecration of Churches and of Confirmations, he said that they were the mechanical parts of a Bishop's duties. Mechanical! Why, Confirmations belong to the most spiritual part of his functions. They are occasions on which he comes in contact with his diocese as its Curate—that is to say, as the man who is charged with the souls of the whole diocese. Mr. Mackarness has suggested that there should next year be a Section to consider the whole question of patronage. I think that suggestion is an extremely valuable one; for I do not think there is any subject at the present time that requires more discussion or that presents more practical difficulties. Many of those difficulties have been alluded to; and though I do not deny that they may be got over, I confess I do not at present see my way clear to their solution. We are surrounded by difficulties. We feel that we want more Bishops and that we can't have them. We feel that it is only just that the Convocations of the Church should have more power, and we feel that they can't have it. All these are checks upon the Church of England from which she must desire with the help of God to get free. I will conclude by mentioning a thought which came into my mind while listening to the sermon of the Archbishop of Canterbury. The most rev. prelate took a most striking text for his discourse, and I think we must all have entirely sympathised with him as he argued that God must have great things in store for the Church of England, or He would not have done what He has already done for her. I think, however, that there is something to be learned from the next verse—"And the woman bare a son and

called his name Samson." Knowing what we know, and seeing what we see, we may well ask who is to be the Samson that is to unloose the bonds which bind our Church? We want our Samson; and one of the things which these Congresses can do, is to raise up by degrees such a condition of public feeling as will bear down all opposition and break the bonds of the Church of England.

THE REV. P. S. DUVAL: There is one matter that bears heavily upon the clergy upon which I wish to say a few words. In the metropolitan districts, as we all know, there are schools, bible classes, and various other institutions which need support, and which are in fact supported chiefly through the medium of the clergy, who in many cases have no help from the laity, however much they may wish that the laity would partake of their labours. Rooms have to be provided, and the organization has to be carried out; and that cannot be done without that very important thing, money. When a parish is subdivided all these institutions, schools, reading rooms, and the like, have to be provided; and this is often found, as my own incumbent has found it, a very difficult matter. We have to write letter after letter, and send out circular after circular—in fact a clergyman may have to spend half, if not more than half, his time in begging means to support his parochial institutions. This evil has very much increased by the system of subdividing parishes which is so very much in vogue; and the question is whether much trouble and expense would be saved and greater efficiency obtained if in these particulars there were one central organization for the whole parish, when its area is such as to allow the schools to be placed at a convenient distance from all parts of it. It seems to me that by reducing the present number of small incumbencies and bringing us back to the old curate system, we should not only consult the interests of the church, and relieve the clergy from an oppressive responsibility, but raise the position of the curates and enable them to be employed in the manner best suited to their respective qualities. They might be incumbents of the different kinds of work in the parish instead of incumbents of districts.

THE DEAN OF ELY then pronounced the benediction.

DE GREY ROOMS. WEDNESDAY MORNING.

The Right Rev. the LORD BISHOP OF RIPON in the Chair.

ADULT AND SUNDAY SCHOOLS AND CATECHIZING.

THE REV. EDWD. JACKSON READ THE FOLLOWING PAPER.

A Paper on Sunday Schools and Night Schools, especially on the former, may very probably raise the enquiry and objection, What can there be said on such a subject, which is not familiar to every one? And, indeed, I have reason to believe, that such objection was made, when the various topics to be discussed at this Church Congress were under preliminary consideration.

And as a further reason why the subject of Sunday Schools need not occupy the attention of Churchmen now, it must be remembered that there are many who are prepared to advance very strong objections to the Sunday School System altogether, and who would rather hear of its being quietly discontinued, than of any serious consideration of its benefits.

The objections thus entertained may perhaps be reckoned under four heads:

1. Sunday Schools are no proper part of the Church System; they are a modern Institution, and have no authorization from the Prayer Book, or other formal Document of the Church.

2. They are almost an insupportable burden to the Clergy, coming as an additional labour on that day, when the duties are already often more than can be rightly fulfilled.
3. Sunday Schools have manifestly greatly failed in their results, so large a proportion of those, who are admitted into them, never becoming consistent Members of the Church.
4. The large development of superior Day School Education, of which by far the greater part is given in National Schools, under the influence of the Clergy, renders Church Sunday School Teaching no longer necessary.

Now, without for the moment saying whether these objections are well or ill founded, the mere fact that they are entertained, and that they are in danger of being increasingly held, is a reason, if there were no other, for the very thoughtful consideration of the subject. The Sunday School system is, to say the least, of too grave proportions to be allowed quietly to sink into insignificance, and the manner in which it is still cultivated and estimated by Dissenters, should at any rate suggest the enquiry whether before we allow it to go into abeyance, we are thoroughly satisfied it has done its full work for the Church.

I have myself a strong opinion upon the subject, and the experience of upwards of thirty years, during which I have had the charge of the same Sunday School, in the large manufacturing town of Leeds, may perhaps be a justification of my responding to the request of the Executive Committee of the Congress, that I would read a Paper on the subject.

And I do not know that I can better approach the question than by referring again to the objections which have already been stated, and making my replies to those objections embody my convictions of the positive benefits which I believe Sunday Schools, when properly conducted, are calculated to produce.

1. That Sunday Schools are not an incongruous institution in connexion with the general system of the Church will, I think, appear evident, when it is considered how impossible it would otherwise be to bring the mass of the Children in contact with the Church at all. To say nothing of the great good of merely keeping them out of the streets on the Lord's Day, the leisure day of the week, and therefore the day of moral hurt and temptation, how without a system similar to that of Sunday Schools could the Clergy ever obtain the attendance of children at Church, and so at Catechising?

Sunday Schools viewed in this light are just an absolute necessity, arising out of the great increase of the population, and enable the Church to fulfil one of her most important functions, which otherwise she would be unable to discharge. And that such is the true view of the question is shewn by the fact, that the Church of Rome values and fosters such gatherings of Children, and in some of her great Cathedrals abroad, Classes of Children taught by lay people, under the superintendence of the Priests, may be regularly seen every Lord's Day.

There can indeed be no doubt, that if Sunday Schools were generally discontinued, the Church would lose the greater part of the Children that now are under her influence.

2. But it is said, that Sunday Schools are a great burden to the Clergy, being an additional duty on the day when they have already enough to do. Yet, are not the clergy bound to catechise and instruct the young of their Flocks, and would this clear and imperative duty on their part be a less onerous one, if there were no Sunday Schools to prepare the children for public catechising? If the whole instruction of the children, and not the mere examination and exhortation of them, lay on the clergy, would not the burden, now so largely lessened by the Sunday School, be then really an insupportable one? And with regard to the active part the clergy themselves need take in the Sunday Schools, it may be said, that the less they do almost the better. Confided to the care of intelligent and pious Lay people, the Superintendents being the Vicars of the clergy, and the Teachers duly appointed by them as Catechists, each with a definite charge; beyond regular visitation, and the oversight and direction of the whole (which latter can to a great extent, by a careful inspection of Class Registers, &c., be done off the Sunday), the clergy need have little or no extra work, from the fact of having Sunday Schools in connexion with their Churches.

3. The third objection we enumerated is perhaps the most general one; viz., that Sunday Schools have failed, as a whole, to attach the children belonging to them permanently to the Church. This is to a great extent true, and it is equally true of another Institution—the Church itself. If the Sunday School system has not succeeded in attaching all its children to the Church, certainly the Church has still more signally failed in attaching the Population generally to its Ordinances and to its Head.

The fact is, Sunday Schools have just so far failed as they are an Institution, worked by very imperfect agents, upon a very unpromising material; and so has the Church failed: so has Christianity failed.

But on the other hand, where the Sunday School system has been carried out by intelligent and pious Christians, there has ever been found a result greatly to the glory of God, the advancement of religion, and the good of the Church. It must indeed be so from the nature of the case.

For this let me refer to facts. In the Sunday School with which I have been so long connected, and which is situated in the lowest locality, physically and morally, in Leeds, a locality so repulsive, that few would ever wish to visit it, except when called there by necessity or duty, there are at present nearly one hundred regular Communicants, besides as many more either in the congregation or settled elsewhere, all of whom are Communicants owing to their present or past connexion with the Sunday School. About twenty-five of the teachers in the school have been scholars themselves; six of the former scholars or teachers have become ordained Missionaries abroad, and another is now waiting to be ordained, while two have been for years active Clergymen in the Church at home, and four more are preparing at this time for the Ministry. The same school has furnished between thirty and forty Certificated Day School Masters and Mistresses. It has contributed for the last fifteen years an average sum of at least Thirty Pounds per annum for the Missionary work of the Church:—the amount for this year being about

Fifty Pounds—and the whole of this the voluntary systematic contributions of the teachers and scholars!

4. But the last objection we had to consider was that of the great increase of Day School Tuition; this, it is argued, rendering Sunday Schools the less necessary. This is an argument to which we must more fully reply.

Now, allowing that the need for teaching children to read on Sundays no longer generally exists (though it yet does to some extent) and the ground on which Raikes founded his first Sunday School at Gloucester cannot now generally be maintained, yet in the very fact, that through the abundant provisions of our Day Schools and their excellence, nearly all our children and young people learn to read, and often read well, I say in this very fact, we have the loudest call for a continuance of Sunday Schools, and still more for their greater development and improvement. What! with their intellects so much more trained, with the power of obtaining information so largely increased, with the Periodical Journal, and the Daily Penny Newspaper, are we to give up the only institution which is at all calculated to save our young people from a demoralizing literature and a revolutionary press? Is the Church to let go her hold of a system which, when rightly worked, will save some portion of the mass of the population from vice and infidelity, and turn those who would otherwise be ranked amongst her opponents, into her life and death friends? Never was the need of association between the religious and moral portion of the community and the masses more needed, and never was that peculiar influence which the Sunday School system brings to bear upon the young, and through the children and young people upon their parents, more peremptorily required than in the present day!

Day School instruction indeed, however valuable it be, can never effect what our Sunday Schools have specially to keep in view. In our manufacturing districts, for some years back, such has been the demand for juvenile labour, that the children are taken away from the Day School at an increasingly early age: a boy or girl at eleven years is scarcely to be found now in the ranks. And what would become of them, or where would there be any supply of candidates for Confirmation from the working classes, if the Sunday School did not continue the hold of early years? Once out of the Day School, they would pass out of the reach of Church influence, in most cases never to be brought back. How often is it found in the case of those who have fallen away from Church influence, and for the larger part of their lives have been estranged from religion, that, when visited by the clergy on their sick bed, it is the Sunday School influence and teaching, and not the Day School, which still remains for good, and which comes back in their time of trial and sorrow, as the voice of their best and happiest days!

Nor ought there to be left out of view, in considering the need of Sunday School influence, and that an increased influence, the very serious dangers which threaten the interests of religion and morals from several comparatively novel causes. First, we may mention those most hurtful influences now at work so largely and so increasingly in our great towns—cheap concerts and balls at public-

houses, dancing gardens, low theatrical representations, and other modes of drawing the working classes, and especially the young, into scenes of self-indulgence and excess. A further and more serious evil lies in the excursion trains and cheap trips, which are alike injurious to the domestic tie and home influence, as well as to the obligation of the Lord's Day, and the duties of religion, whilst they greatly foster a selfish expenditure, and necessarily involve a very hurtful association, without regard to character or sex. All these dangers call loudly to the Church to be up and doing, and to leave no instrumentality untried, and no institution unsupported, which is calculated to check these fearful dangers of our times.

And here I may mention, as a startling illustration of what has been said, that in the Sunday School Statistics presented at the recent Wesleyan Methodist Conference, it appeared, that while they reported an increase of 5000 in the number of Sunday School children during the year, they had to acknowledge a decrease of 250, during the same period, of the teachers. This is highly significant, bearing in mind that the larger portion of their teachers are young people.

No; we cannot spare our Sunday Schools: we require them more than ever; and having this conviction so strongly, I deeply regret to acknowledge, that in my judgment Sunday Schools are not keeping pace either with the increase of the population, or with the rapidly increasing activity of mind and enlarged information of the working classes.

This is a most serious consideration, especially if the views laid down in this paper, as to the great importance of Sunday Schools, be correct.

The question naturally arises, What is to be done? And the answer is obvious. Improve the Sunday School as much as possible, and make it the valuable auxiliary to the parochial system, and the powerful moral, social, and religious agency, which it is capable of becoming.

1. Sunday Schools generally want a better organization: a more thorough discipline, and a duly graduated system of instruction; and this latter should be made to bear upon the scholars with especial regard to their Church Membership. Regular teaching of the meaning and use of the Prayer Book has been too much neglected, and should form an essential element in the course of instruction in every Church Sunday School. This will lead to a better appreciation of the Divine Service in church, and to a more willing attendance at it.

2. Sunday School Teachers are not, it is feared, as a rule, efficient, and duly qualified for the work. Where persons of education and higher social position are able to take a part, they should be induced to do so; for social elevation has of itself an important influence, and this combined with intelligence and personal piety, has a great power over not only Sunday School children, but the working classes generally. But such may not always, nor commonly, be had, and this makes it the more important, that the Pastor in calling to his aid earnest Christian people of a lower grade in society, should offer them his assistance in preparing the Sunday

instruction. A weekly Scripture Class primarily intended for the teachers, but extended to the older scholars, has been found most beneficial in promoting an intelligent appreciation and impartation of religious truth.

3. It is most important that the Confirmed Scholars should be confided to the care of the more intelligent and experienced of the Congregation, who may be willing to take part in this very responsible duty. If possible, these classes should meet apart from the rest of the School, and not in Church be required to sit with the younger children. In some cases, these elder scholars, along with such adults as might be induced to attend, might with greater convenience to both themselves and the teacher, meet at the private residence of the latter, and be dismissed in time to attend Church. This has been tried with great advantage; a very strong bond thus being often contracted between the teacher and his charge: and in this way many, ladies especially, who might otherwise be unable to assist, can give a very valuable aid to Sunday instruction.

4. Night Schools should, wherever practicable, be connected with Sunday Schools. They will generally only meet in the winter months, but the simple Lectures and Readings on scientific and other subjects, might go on at regular intervals all the year round. I have found the Night School a peculiarly favourable ground for cultivating a kindly and beneficial hold on the young people, and would strongly recommend this sphere of influence to my brother clergy.

The main difficulty with regard to Night Schools is in connexion with bringing the elder girls out from their homes, and this applies both to town and country,—perhaps most to the latter; without great care, the hurt resulting from their being out thus late in the evenings, will over-balance any good they may obtain from the School.

5. With the Night Schools may be combined the cultivation of Church Music; a study and occupation increasingly acceptable to young people; but perhaps for this reason, as well as others, requiring caution and watchfulness, that it be not extended to the injury and neglect of other and more important matters.

6. The next point to which I would advert, I can scarcely, judging from my own experience, lay too much stress upon; I allude now to the close pastoral care and guardianship to be exercised over our young people, ever necessary, and in these days, as I have endeavoured to shew, pre-eminently needed. For this end I would recommend the formation of classes of the Confirmed, who should meet the Clergyman at least once in every month, when advanced instruction in the doctrines and duties of religion should be given, and the special dangers to which the young people may be exposed, and the special duties they ought to discharge, should be in a kindly and sympathetic spirit brought before them. Of course all such meetings should be accompanied by prayer. But these classes and meetings should on no account prevent or stand in place of individual dealing with our young people. Here is the Pastor's strongest influence; here generally the most untoward will bow before him; here the earnest appeal and the believing prayer have often resulted in the close enclosure of some precious young Christians into the innermost enclosure of Christ's Fold.

7. Lastly, our young people, if they are to be retained in the Church, and thus our Sunday School system not rendered fruitless, must have something given them to do. Their religious convictions and aspirations after goodness, and the example of Jesus Christ should be crystalized and put into effort and action. "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work"—this should be the principle, Divinely enunciated, which should be steadily kept before the minds of our Confirmed young people.

And what should they do? Tract distribution in regularly appointed districts, or in the mills where they work; visiting of poor and sick people; endeavours to bring neglected children to school; systematic efforts to spread an interest in the Missions of the Church, and to obtain contributions for their support. Some may be capable of assisting in the Parochial Savings' Bank; in the one connected with my Sunday School, and wholly managed under my presidency by young people connected with the school, the total amount of deposits for this year will probably reach One Thousand Pounds;—others may carry on a very good work, which I can again speak of from experience, viz., the sale of cheap and useful periodicals—of which upwards of 14,000 were thus put into circulation by our Book Society last year, and a profit of £15 was made, which was handed over to me for the use of the sick and poor:—and in other ways may our young people most usefully for themselves seek to advance the social, moral, and religious good of all around them, or within their reach. And it should be borne in mind, that whilst judging of their fitness for any work by their apparent qualifications, that the work itself not unfrequently makes the fitness; and that the best way of shewing a man how to do a thing, is by giving him it to do.

And with this view of Sunday School work I may well conclude. For if it be a system, as I have attempted to shew, eminently required for the welfare of the young themselves, belonging to the masses around us, and if it be the only instrumentality yet seen and adopted that fairly grasps the child, and draws him to School, to Church, and the Pastor, and thus places him within the reach of earnest, prayerful, and persistent efforts for his good;—if it be the one agency of all others, which has the welcome entree of the working man's house, and secures his respect, and generally his gratitude for the self-denying and disinterested care manifested for his child;—if it thus performs a most important social, as well as religious mission, so may it be confidently asserted, that the Sunday School system is of all her auxiliary agencies, the most reactive for good on the Church herself.

How much of the spiritual life of the Church generally is closely connected with the Sunday School! How generally are those belonging to its band of teachers the most exemplary members of the congregation; the most regular at Church; the most frequent at Communion? How many earnest young men (might we not say hundreds?) have entered the Universities or Theological Colleges, and thus become Ministers in her sanctuaries, spreading the light of the Gospel both at home and in distant parts of the world,—who felt their first impulse to the holy calling, while teaching a class of Sunday School children! How many thousands of earnest prayers for the good of these same children have come back with teeming

blessings on the teachers, their families, and the congregations with which they were connected; and how many sacred friendships have been formed within the walls of the Sunday School, cementing hearts together now in the love of Christ, and in true service for Him, and destined to be bonds of true Love in Christ for ever!

THE REV. FRANCIS HESSEY, D. C. L. READ THE FOLLOWING PAPER

ON PUBLIC CATECHIZING,

CONSIDERED ESPECIALLY AS A MEANS OF ATTACHING TO THE CHURCH
THE MORE EDUCATED CLASSES OF THE ENGLISH PEOPLE.

No man can set too high a value on the subject, (Adult and Sunday Schools) which, in the paper just read, has been brought before the Congress. There is, however, still room for the consideration of a practice, which was established in the Church long before Adult or Sunday Schools existed. It may now appear to be only one of the many works appropriate to a Christian School; yet in reality it is important enough to stand alone.

By the word *Catechizing* we generally understand the imparting of knowledge in such a way as to exercise the understanding of the person instructed, and to enable him to give it back again in an accurate form. For this purpose question and answer have usually been employed. Socrates, as was observed long ago by George Herbert,¹ may, from his peculiar method of teaching, be called a Catechist. He contrived to draw forth the knowledge of all with whom he conversed, and so to correct and improve it, as to leave them in a position very far in advance of that which they occupied at the beginning of the conversation.

The same method appears to have been adopted by the public teachers who succeeded Socrates at Athens; nor is it likely that St. Paul, when he preached in the market-place² of that city, or in the school of Tyrannus at Ephesus³ reasoned in any very different manner. Indeed, if we may say so with reverence, our Blessed Lord Himself may be said to have used a Catechetical method of teaching, when He throughout His ministry so conversed with His Disciples on religious subjects as to prepare them to be the teachers of others afterwards.

The word itself is not strange to the New Testament, though it appears not even once in our authorised translation. St. Luke writes his Gospel, that Theophilus may know the certainty of those things in which he has been *Catechised*, or instructed in detail.⁴ Apollos is said to have been *Catechised*, or elementarily instructed in the way of the Lord.⁵ St. Paul describes a Jewish controversialist as having been *Catechised*, or thoroughly instructed, out of the Law.⁶ And in discussing the value of Spiritual gifts, he declares his preference of being able to speak five words with his understanding, that he might

(1) Priest to the Temple S. 21.

(4) Luke i. 4.

(2) Acts xvii. 17.

(5) Acts xviii. 25.

(3) Acts xix. 9.

(6) Rom. ii. 18.

Catechise others, to the power of uttering an unknown tongue.¹ And lastly the Jewish Christians, who were zealous of the law, are said to have been *Catechised*, that is to have had the information thoroughly dinned, as it were, into their ears, that St. Paul had taught their countrymen in heathen lands to forsake Moses.²

Such occasional use of the word in the New Testament prepares us for the more frequent and technical use of it in the later history of the Church. Disciples, or learners of Gospel truth, were called *Christians* first at Antioch; but under that title were probably comprised, even at that early day, and certainly in the next century, many persons who had not yet been baptized. Those who had been admitted to that blessed Sacrament, were called the "faithful" or the "perfect;" but those under preparatory instruction were called "*catechumens*," or persons catechised. To this humble rank they were admitted by imposition of hands and prayer, and continued in it sometimes for many years. Thus, for instance, the Emperor Constantine was not baptized till a short time before his death, yet none would have therefore denied him the title of a Christian. During this time, whether long or short, (and its duration appears to have varied according to their own zeal or that of their instructors) they were initiated by those who were called Catechists into the rudiments of the faith, as they were ready to receive them. The Scriptures were not put at once into their hands, but the matter of them was gradually instilled into their minds. The ordinary course pursued is thus described in the Apostolical Constitutions, which give us, not (as they were once supposed to do) the account of what the Apostles intended to be the system of the Church, but at least a correct picture of its condition some time previously to the Council of Nicæa.

"Let the Catechumen be taught before his Baptism, the knowledge of the Father Unbegotten, the additional knowledge of the Only-begotten Son, the completeness of knowledge of the Holy Spirit. Let him learn the order of creation, the arrangements of Providence, the decisions of varied legislation. Let him be instructed why the world was made, and why man was appointed the citizen of the world. Let him also know his own nature, of what kind it is. Let him be taught how God punished the wicked by water, and by fire, and glorified the saints in every generation. Let him also learn how God in His Providence, never forsook mankind, but called them, at different periods, from error and vanity to the knowledge of the truth, from slavery and impiety, to freedom and devotion, from iniquity to righteousness, from everlasting death to eternal life. After this he must learn the doctrine of Christ's incarnation, His passion, His resurrection and ascension. And lastly, he must be taught what it is to renounce the devil, and to enter into covenant with Christ."³ In the course of this instruction, it will be observed, that there is no mention of the Holy Communion, concerning which it was not customary to teach the Catechumens anything, till after their baptism. They were divided into four classes, and eventually were admitted, after severe probation, to Holy Baptism. Their instructors, or *Catechists*, formed no special order in the Church. On great occasions

(1) 1 Cor. xiv. 19.

(2) Acts xxi. 21.

(3) Constit. Apost. l. vii. § xl. •

the Bishop, on other occasions a Priest, or Deacon discharged the office; and sometimes even a member of some lower Order, as for instance a Reader, was allowed to catechise. Of the diligence with which this duty was performed, we have an example in the still remaining catechetical lectures of St. Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem. And of the importance which he himself attached to such instruction, we may judge from the following passage.

“Abide thou in the Catechisings: though the discourse be long, be not thou wearied out; for thou art receiving thine armour against the antagonist power; against heresies, against Jews, Samaritans, and Gentiles. Thou hast many enemies; take to thee many darts; thou hast many to hurl them at; and thou hast need to learn how to hurl them at the Greek; how to do battle against Heretic, Jew, and Samaritan. The armour indeed is ready, and most ready is the sword of the Spirit; but thou must also stretch forth thy hands with good resolve, that thou mayest war the Lord’s warfare, mayest overcome the powers that oppose thee, mayest escape defeat from every heretical attempt. This charge also I give thee:—Study the things that are spoken, and keep them for ever. Think not that they are the ordinary homilies, which are excellent indeed, and trustworthy, but if neglected to-day, may be attended to to-morrow. On the contrary, the teaching concerning the laver of regeneration, delivered in course, how shall it be made up, if to-day it be neglected? Consider it to be the planting season;—unless we dig and that deeply, how shall that afterwards be planted rightly, which has once been planted ill? or consider Catechising to be a kind of building;—unless we dig deep and lay the foundation; unless by successive fastenings in the masonry, we so bind the framework of the house together that no opening be detected, nor any work left unsound, nought avails all our former labour. But stone must succeed stone in course, and corner must follow corner, and, inequalities being smoothed away, the masonry must rise with regularity. In like manner, we are bringing to thee the stones as it were of knowledge; thou must learn concerning the living God; concerning judgment, concerning Christ; concerning the resurrection; and many things are made to follow one the other, which, though now dropped in one by one, are at length presented in harmonious connexion. But if thou wilt not combine them into one whole, and remember what is first, and what is second, the builder indeed buildeth, but the building will be unstable.”¹

As the belief in Christianity was more extensively spread over the world, the children of the faithful were baptized for the most part in infancy. A similar course of instruction to that described above, was still however exacted from young Christians. Hence the word *Catechumens* came to be applied, as at present, to baptized Christians, who were still under instruction. Various manuals were written for their religious training, before the Reformation; and when, in the 16th Century, so large a part of Europe was compelled to renounce the communion of the Church of Rome, similar works were printed in various countries, with the view of setting forth in a simple form,

(1) Catechetical Lectures of S. Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem, Introductory Lectures § x.

not only the teaching of pure Christianity, but a protest against prevailing error.

Such are, for instance, the Catechisms of Luther, (A.D. 1529,) and the Heidelberg Catechism, (A.D. 1563.) Such are the Assembly's Catechisms, which, though framed by Presbyterians in England, (A.D. 1648) are chiefly used in Scotland; and such also are many other less famous controversial and didactic formularies, which, having been committed to memory in childhood, were designed to perpetuate the distinctive views of various Christian societies. Such, too, is our own Church Catechism, which is remarkable for its abstinence from mere controversy, and seems designed to embody, in their simplest and most satisfactory form, the tenets of the Church of Christ, as freed from the developments of Romanism.

A Catechism, such as any of these, is of course designed primarily to be committed to memory by the Catechumens, and at certain times repeated by them with verbal accuracy to their teachers. But this has never been understood to be its sole use. It is intended to be a text-book for the Catechist, by whom every question is capable of being expanded into many. That such use was intended to be made of the Catechism of the Church of England, appears from a rubric which immediately follows it, and which stood thus in King Edward's first Book of Common Prayer, issued in the year 1549.—“The Curate of every Parish, once in six weeks at the least, upon warning by him being given, shall, upon some Sunday or Holyday, half an hour before Evensong, openly in the Church, instruct and examine so many children of his Parish sent unto him as he shall think convenient, *in some part of this Catechism.*”

In King Edward's second Book, A.D. 1552, this rubric was altered, so as to order that public Catechising should be more frequent, and to allow of its being conducted, if needful, by some other person in the Curate's place. “The Curate of the Parish, or some other at his appointment, shall diligently upon Sundays and Holydays, half an hour before Evensong, openly in the Church, instruct and examine so many children of his Parish sent unto him as he shall think convenient, *in some part of this Catechism.*”

And in both Books, this direction followed:—“And all fathers, mothers, masters, and dames, shall cause their children, servants, and apprentices, [which are not confirmed, 1549,] [which have not learned their Catechism, 1552,] to come to Church at the [day, 1549,] [time, 1552,] appointed, and obediently to hear and be ordered by the Curate; until such time as they have learned all that is here appointed for them to learn.”

And in the same spirit is framed the 59th Canon of 1604.—“Every parson, vicar, or curate, upon every Sunday and Holyday, before Evening prayer, shall, for half an hour or more, examine and instruct the youth and ignorant persons of his Parish, in the Ten Commandments, the Articles of the Belief, and the Lord's Prayer, and shall diligently hear, instruct, and teach them the Church Catechism, set forth in the Book of Common Prayer. And all fathers, mothers, masters, and mistresses, shall cause their children, servants, and apprentices, which have not learned the Catechism, to come to the Church at the hour appointed, devoutly to hear and be ordered by

the minister, until they have learned the same. And if any minister neglect his duty herein, let him be sharply reprov'd, upon the first complaint, and true notice thereof given to the Bishop or Ordinary of the place. If, after submitting himself, he shall willingly offend therein again, let him be suspended. If so the third time, there being little hope that he will therein be reformed, then let him be excommunicated, and so remain until he will be reformed."

Had the practice of Catechising been maintained in the manner prescribed in this Canon, the troubles, which are generally summed up under the title of the Great Rebellion, had they taken place at all, would have assumed a less dangerous form. For the youth of the nation would have been proof against the suggestions of the Presbyterians, and still more so against those of the Independents, whose successive attacks brought the national Church so nearly to ruin.

On the restoration of the Church system after the Great Rebellion, catechising was made even a more prominent feature of Divine Service than before, and was appointed to take place after the second Lesson at Evening Prayer. It was evidently believed by the revisers of our Liturgy (A. D. 1661), that the Catechising of the young people of a congregation would be useful, not only to themselves, but also to their parents, and others who might be present. And such is, no doubt, the case. Much precious knowledge may be gradually instilled into the minds of the elder members of a family, in the course of a lesson given to their children. But to do this well required a certain degree of earnestness and attention on the part of the catechist. He had to consider the intellectual powers and the religious wants, not merely of the young, but of the old and to take care that his own stores of learning were ready to meet the demand made upon them. In fact, a considerable previous preparation had to be made, and quite as much labour had to be bestowed on a catechetical lesson as on a sermon.

It was this necessity of earnestness, in an indifferent age, that caused the great neglect of catechising for which what is called the Georgian period of our nation's history, is but too remarkable. A young generation grew up untaught, and the result was a vast amount of practical heathenism. There was great need of the warning voices of Wesley and Whitefield, to stir up an interest in the most elementary truths of religion among the rustic population of England and Wales. And when the religious feelings of the people had once been roused, so little were the parochial clergy disposed to take advantage of the increased earnestness of their flocks, and to train them in the ways of the Church of their fathers, that this movement terminated rather in the enlargement of dissenting communities, than in the strengthening of the national Church.

One token of religious revival among Dissenters, was the establishment of their Sunday Schools, in which it was intended that the children of the worshippers at each conventicle, should be taught betimes the principles on which their parents had separated themselves from the Church of England. The notion of such schools was taken from the practice of a few zealous clergymen, whose example was at the time so little followed, that it is now commonly believed, that the first Sunday Schools were opened by Dissenters. There

is no doubt, however, that for a long time the Dissenters' Sunday Schools were much more numerous than those of the Church. At length, indeed, Sunday Schools became common in our town parishes, and were held, as is not a little remarkable, at the very time originally appointed for Catechising, immediately before Church service. But whether it were that the notion of such schools was, in the minds of many, associated with the practices of Dissenting congregations, or that the teachers in Church Sunday Schools, though sincere in their religious feelings, were not very decided in their attachment to the Church, or even that many of the clergy were not very clear in their Church views, there was at first very little to distinguish the Church Sunday School from that attached to the Dissenting Meeting House. In some instances, the Church Catechism was not taught at all. In many others, if taught, it was not made the basis of any system of teaching.

Gradually, however, the clergy throughout the country were led to pay more attention to their Sunday Schools, to systematise the teaching given in them, and to take pains in the training of their Sunday school teachers, in order that through them the Church's doctrine might reach the children. In many Churches also the system of public catechising was resumed at certain stated times of the year, as for example during Lent. And though very often there was a great stiffness in such catechising, as it was little more than the public repetition of questions, which had already been asked in the same form, of the same children, by the same catechist, in the school-room, it could not be without its good effect. But the real revival of public catechising, in its spirit and its power, may be said to be due to Archdeacon Bather, who, after many years of humble labour as a catechist, delivered in 1835 a striking charge on the subject. That charge has frequently been reprinted, and with its valuable appendix forms an excellent manual for a catechist. He himself relates, in a very graphic manner how he became a catechist.

"I was inducted in 1804 to the living which I now hold [Meole Brace in the Diocese of Lichfield]. I set to my work at once, and preached as plainly and as well as I knew how; and I should be sorry to think no good came of it. Still I could not but see that with respect to the elder part of my congregation, talk as I would, I could not talk it into them. Now and then I might say a thing that would strike them: but as to the general argument of my discourse, it was all thrown away. I then turned myself to the younger sort. We had at that time in the parish a good many boys from thirteen to seventeen years of age. They worked in the Collicries on week days, and came to Church on Sundays, and they were generally very well disposed. I will take my catechumens from them, I thought; but then, not one in six could read. I found a couple of working colliers, who could read very well, and I made them my Sunday School Masters. The chief thing they had to do was this:—I appointed them a portion of Scripture, not exceeding two verses at the most, and I saw they could read it themselves with intelligence. They then read it, pause by pause, to the boys, who soon learnt the words, and could repeat them with intelligence too. Then, after Divine Service, I got my pupils to deliver the passage to me with one voice, and I questioned them upon

it, and by this means I found that I could communicate much religious knowledge, which might be, and has been, held fast until now. Besides this, I had two little Dame Schools containing sixty children each, and I thought I could try to do something with them that might be of use to others who should hear them. I appointed a service on a week day, and catechised these children before the congregation. It was very hard work. I could not, for a long while, get the children to speak audibly and distinctly, and I was obliged to answer three quarters of the questions myself. However, you will always have a sharp lad or two among 120 children, and Jack made a good hit now and then, and Tom now and then, and the parents were pleased. Besides which, as the parents sat in the pews close to the aisles in which the children were placed, I could sometimes ask them a question, and often get a pertinent answer."¹

This extract will give some idea of the difficulties under which public catechising was revived at the beginning of the present century. The establishment of National Schools soon made the work easier, and it has now become a recognised part of the system of many country parishes.

We cannot too highly prize such manuals as those printed in Edinburgh by Dean Ramsay, Archdeacon Sinclair, and Dean Bagot, (all of which have since been reprinted in London); the various books of the Church of England Sunday School Institute, Parker's Catechetical Series, Mozley's Monthly Papers of Sunday Teaching, and various papers issued by the National Society, and the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. Nearly all these have been principally used for the instruction of the poor, or of the lower middle class, and doubtless with very good effect. But if the catechetical system be of use to these, it surely ought to be equally valuable to children whose parents move in a higher rank of society. The children of the poor need to be thus instructed by the clergy, because their parents are often unable to train them at all. The children of those above the poor need similar instruction, partly because their parents often lack the time to take in hand their religious education, partly because many of them are at schools, where more attention is paid to their intellectual than to their religious development, and partly also because, however earnest may be the parents or the school teachers, their teaching is unsystematic, and needs perhaps also that authority which the clergyman of a parish should be able to exert over the young people of his flock.

For these reasons, it is becoming every day more important for the clergy, and especially for those whose work is among a town population, to revive the use of catechising among the children of what is called the better class. They have, many of them, introduced something of the kind, during the few weeks of an immediate preparation for confirmation and first communion. And they have doubtless found the result, in many cases, so encouraging, that they have heartily wished that they had begun the system much earlier, or could continue it a little longer. In other cases they have been deeply grieved to find such uncultivated ground in the hearts of their candidates, and have

(1) Archdeacon Bather's *Hints for Catechising*. Introduction, p. 39. Rivingtons, London.

sighed to think that they have been so late in commencing the work of Church education. But the season has passed by, without the needful effort being made, and the same feelings are revived with more poignancy, when the next annual or perhaps triennial confirmation is approaching.

And yet the remedy was at hand, and might in most cases have been readily applied, in the introduction of public catechising for the advantage of the children of the more educated classes. There are churches, in which this has been done, and with the happiest result. One parish might be named, in which such catechising has been carried on without interruption, except during necessary vacations, for nearly twenty years.

It involves, no doubt, some labour and difficulty:—But what good work does not? It has also its discouragements:—But for these patience and confidence in the goodness of the cause will find a remedy.

The first difficulty that will occur to most clergymen is—"how can I get my catechumens together for previous instruction? For the children of the lower class I can use my National School as a place of previous instruction during the week. But I cannot go to each house and each boarding school in the parish and so talk over, on a week day, the subject of my intended Sunday's catechising, as to prepare the minds of the young people to give intelligent answers. I could not spare the time and labour necessary for such work."

Perhaps not, I reply, nor am I sure that such would be the best course. The Church is your place for meeting them. Let but the Church be opened at some convenient time on a week day, and let it be understood that there will be a lecture regularly given on that day, after morning or evening prayer, to young people, in connexion with and in preparation for a Catechetical lesson on the following Sunday afternoon, and the first and greatest difficulty is got over. It may be that such lectures are but thinly attended, sometimes perhaps chiefly by the parents and school teachers, rather than by the young people themselves. Still they have their use, they will give a tone to the religious lessons, whether of the parent or the teacher, and so be transmitted to the mind of the pupils.

To give system to such lectures, and to ensure a proper anticipation of the main points of the catechetical lesson, in the previous lecture, it will be most important to use catechetical papers. These may be drawn up by the clergyman himself, and may exist simply in his own manuscript, for the guidance of his own thoughts; or they may be, which is the better course, cheaply printed by him, and put into the hands of his catechumens.

In case he is not disposed to incur this expense, he may make use of some of the many printed catechetical papers already referred to, and may base upon them his lectures and his catechisings.

Such papers are of various kinds, and will naturally require careful study. Some are in the form of questions, to which texts of Scripture are appended as suggesting the material for answers.—In such cases, it will not be enough to put the question, and expect the text for an answer. In that way, a paper would be exhausted in a few minutes, and very little good done. Each question is designed to be led up to,

and broken into many; each answer will open up a new line of thought, which must be guided into convergence with the purpose in hand. Constant reference must be made to the Church Catechism, to the Prayer Book (especially to the Services of the day on which the catechising is taking place), and above all to Holy Scripture, with which, as illustrated by the Church, it is most important that young people should be early familiarised. For unless Scripture be used in support of the teaching of the Church, those who are under the Church's guidance will not be duly prepared to resist the false arguments too often broached in society, which are based for the most part upon a misapplication of Scripture.

"But will there not be a difficulty," some will say, "in inducing the children of the better classes to take their places in a catechetical class?" There may be, we answer; but this difficulty is not insuperable. Some parents may think that there is a publicity in such lessons, which they think undesirable for their children; and some children themselves may on this account dislike them. But such publicity is not felt, if the young people are encouraged to answer, simultaneously, instead of being questioned, and expected to answer separately. It will be very easy, when this is done, for the catechist to pick out the right from the wrong answers, to correct mistakes, to modify and develop insufficient statements, and so to carry on the lesson as to encourage the well informed, without painfully exposing the ignorance of any. It will be found in practice that young people, who are thus publicly catechised, become more and more interested in their lessons, and regret when circumstances compel them to discontinue their attendance upon them. It will not unfrequently happen that those, who have left their home, or their school, and thus have been unable to attend the Church in which such catechising takes place, have corresponded with their companions, their teachers, or even the clergyman, and requested to receive copies of the successive papers.

But, it may be said, will parents and school teachers submit to this invasion of their peculiar province, as they may naturally consider the religious education of their children to be? If, we answer, the work be judiciously managed, it will be found that so far from superseding their instructions, the catechetical lesson will supplement and direct them. Both parents and school teachers have felt the difficulty of keeping up a system in their religious teaching from week to week, and of finding materials in which to instruct their children. That difficulty will be removed by letting the young people attend a regular series of catechetical instruction; and the printed paper or the notes of lectures, brought home from week to week, will be found most valuable to parent and child, or teacher and pupil, as supplying a subject for useful conversation, and strengthening, from without, those lessons, that might otherwise be given at home or at school, without awakening the lively interest which it is desirable should be attached to them.

But will it not, some will say, be an injury to the congregation, to rob them of a Sermon, and give them instead of it the mere elementary instruction that is proper for children? It will be no robbery, we believe, in most cases. Even were the catechising merely that of

the first class of a good National School, it would, if well conducted, convey a great amount of useful information. How much more, when the catechumens belong to the more educated ranks of Society? Practically, it is found, in most cases, that parents and other grown persons are as much instructed in a catechetical lesson as in a sermon, and regret the arrival of the vacations, when such lessons are broken off, and sermons substituted for them.

But some of the clergy may hesitate to begin such a work, from the fear that they will not be able to find sufficient materials, especially if the work is to continue from year to year. They will find this anxiety disappear if they begin cautiously, and weigh well the materials which they employ. The Church Catechism itself will supply matter for catechising for many weeks. The Collects, the Epistles, the Gospels, the Sunday lessons, each will form an important series. The history of the Patriarchs, the outlines of Prophecy, the Parables, the Miracles, the harmonised history of the Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, the Book of Common Prayer, the Thirty-nine Articles, will furnish ever interesting and ever varied subjects.

The recurrence of the Confirmation season will introduce a break in the system for the year, and will furnish either a climax for previous instruction, or a starting point for after lessons.

In fact there is no possibility that such a system, once introduced, will ever flag for want of interest. Let the heart of the catechist be in the work, and those of the catechumens and their parents will soon be there also.

In all that has been here said, it is taken for granted that a work such as this is undertaken and carried on in the spirit of prayer. Thus only is it likely to prosper, and it is with this view doubtless that our reformers appointed the time of catechising to be immediately before the Divine Service, or in the course of the Service itself. A devotional tone is thus secured, which ought to preserve the lessons from degenerating into triviality, or into the communication of merely secular information connected with subjects incidentally introduced into Holy Scripture.

There is no more common error than this, on the part of those to whom catechising is a new and untried work. While aiming at being useful and interesting, they forget that all the topics introduced ought to have the effect of illustrating and enforcing dogmatic truth. Such was eminently the case with S. Cyril's catechetical lectures, which are the best specimen of such work in the old time; such not less manifestly is the case with a work put forth last year with the sanction of the Bishop of Oxford, entitled the "*Catechist's Manual*." And if the same cannot be said of all the many manuals that a clergyman may have occasion to use, at least he has the power of so using them as to make his lessons ever illustrate and enforce the Catholic truths of Christianity, as set forth especially in the Church of England.

The reader of this paper would be sorry to be supposed to have said or intended anything in depreciation of Church Sunday Schools, such as those described in a preceding paper. He is far from regarding them, as some of his brethren have done, as necessary evils. He holds them to be, under the present circumstances of the Church in

England, essential to the well-being of a parish. Indeed he would be glad to see them frequented, as they are in Ireland, not merely by the children of the poor, or those immediately above the poor, but by children of all classes. Were this the case, the number of children present in the Church Sunday School of a well-ordered parish would far exceed that of those educated in the National School; and the Parish Priest would be in his proper position as the religious educator of the children of his parishioners. Such is, however, far from being the case. From the last return accessible to the reader of this paper, it appears that the Church of England receives *but three* children in her Sunday schools, out of every *five* that she teaches in her week-day schools. What then becomes of the other *two*? They are at some Dissenting school on the Sunday, and so eventually form a part of a Dissenting congregation, when they are grown up. Dissenters are fully aware of this, and accordingly bestow all their energy on the foundation and maintenance of Sunday schools. They are quite content that the Church should relieve them of the burden of the general education of their children, if they may but gather them in their schools on the Sunday. That this is the case, appears very clearly from the fact that the proportion indicated above is just reversed among the Dissenting bodies of the country. For every child educated in their day schools, Dissenters have *five* in their Sunday schools. Of course we must not blame them for this activity, but endeavour to counter-work it by every means in our power.

What are these means, it hardly forms a part of the subject of this paper to point out. But just this much may be said:—The Parochial Clergy must be on their guard against being compelled to establish and maintain schools which do but provide the Dissenting Chapels with their most intelligent worshippers. They are doing this at present, and are likely to continue to do so, as long as they allow their own Sunday schools to be attended by fewer pupils than their week-day schools. Considering that many pupils have left the day school for work, and yet can easily still attend the Sunday school, the preponderance of numbers ought to be in the other direction. And so it would be, if each parish priest would not merely appear in his Parochial day school, and teach the Catechism there from time to time, but would endeavour to be known by every child and every parent, and let every child and parent understand that an implied condition on which the week-day education is given, is the attendance of those, to whom it is given, at the Sunday school as well. There may be difficulties in the way of doing this, but these difficulties are not insuperable.

Where there are more clergy than one in a parish, it is not difficult for one to be present at the Sunday School; and, even though he does not take a class, to make his presence felt in a variety of ways. Though the Master and Mistress of the National School are not expected to teach on Sunday, it is well for them to be seen there, and to notice which of their daily pupils are absent on Sunday. The children will then see that they too are interested in their religious, as well as in their secular education, and that they do not consider their week to commence on Monday, and end on Friday. Sunday School teachers may also be led to take personal interest in their scholars, as

baptized children of the Church, of whom they are put in charge, and whom they must not therefore, if they can help it, allow to stray from the fold. District visitors and parochial mission women, members of guilds and sisterhoods, may also bear their part in this good work of retaining in the Church Sunday School those who are taught in the Church Day School. Their influence with parents may be often successfully exerted; and where they cannot prevail, they may, by timely information given to the clergyman, prevent the defection of many a youthful member of the Church.

Much is said in the present day of the Conscience Clause as a hardship and a bondage. It is such, no doubt. But it never would have been enforced, had not the clergy, by their indifference to the religious teaching of their young parishioners, brought it upon themselves. That this was indeed the case may be judged from the expression of an eminent Government Inspector of schools, the Rev. W. J. Kennedy—"The clergy almost universally act upon the Conscience Clause, both as to the Catechism and Sunday attendance."

We may reasonably hope that this will be the case no more; that the clergy will now generally insist upon the teaching of the Church Catechism in their Schools. But only half a victory will have been gained, if they do not follow up that advantage by the further step of insisting on Sunday attendance. The Rev. T. Hedley, assistant commissioner of education, has these remarkable words on this point—"I have heard of no single instance in which the religious teaching in a school formed the ground for withdrawing or withholding children from the school. In day schools connected with the Church of England, the Church Catechism is universal, and is of course the vehicle for distinctive and religious teaching; but this seldom appears a matter of much weight with parents in the choice of a school. When the rule of the school requires the attendance of all the children on a Sunday the objection is made."

The words of Mr. Cumin on the subject are almost identical:—"The poor, in selecting a school, look entirely to whether the school supplies good reading, writing, and arithmetic. In almost every National School, the Church Catechism is taught to all the scholars; objection is scarcely ever made. The truth is, the religious difficulty does not exist. So long as the children are allowed to go to the Sunday School connected with the religious denomination to which their parents belong, they make no objection to the National, or to the British system." Yet, more strongly says Mr. Winder, "In many of the Church Day Schools in our district (Bradford and Rochdale), the majority of the children are of Dissenting parents, and attend Dissenting places of worship and Sunday Schools."

Surely such statements as these¹ are enough to shew how essential are good Sunday Schools to the well being of a parish:—a subject which, in a former paper, has been much more prominently brought forward than this. The system of a good Sunday School is, so far as the clergyman personally takes part in it, mainly catechetical. Let it not, however, supersede the catechising in Church, on which the

(1) Many more citations to the same effect may be found in a valuable letter addressed to the Archbishop of Canterbury, by a Priest of twenty years standing in the Diocese of Winchester, entitled "The Sunday School Question." *Bell and Daldy, London, 1866.*

writer of this paper has dwelt. Let the two good works go hand in hand. Let the clergyman catechise the less advanced children in the Sunday School for the most part, in the Church occasionally, but let him by no means omit the good work of educating the higher classes of his parishioners, by catechising them, also, if only their parents will send them to him, in the Church.

If any apology is due to the clergy and laity of the Church here present for dwelling at such length upon so simple and practical a subject as public catechising, let it be this :—the subject is one which has not yet been brought before one of these periodical gatherings ; and it appears to have been long forgotten in the great majority of our parishes. The reader of this paper, having been himself a Catechist for a quarter of a century, and having seen the good result of his work, is anxious to impress upon others the importance of a method of instruction, which may tend, more than any other, to raise up faithful sons and daughters of the Church, who shall be her polished corners in another age.

DISCUSSION.

THE REV. J. BARDSLEY : There can be but one opinion respecting the importance and necessity of catechizing. There can be but one opinion as to the value of the admirable suggestions made by the two preceding papers for pre-occupying the minds of our young people. Improvements of this kind were never more necessary than in the present day ; but I think I shall best answer the purpose of this gathering if I confine my remarks to the importance of Sunday Schools themselves. There is no more important thing for the efficiency of the school is that the clergyman should have efficient teachers. I say *teachers*, not *preachers* set on a stool and addressing an oration to the children. We want teachers who can take the Articles, or the Collects, or the Catechism, but, above all, a chapter of the Bible, break it into questions, and forcibly impress it upon the minds of the children. I agree entirely with the statements made by an earnest and talented writer, who signed himself "A Priest of twenty years' standing," in a letter lately addressed to the Archbishop of Canterbury—namely, "If you want to test the strength of the Church in any particular parish, you will use a fallacious test if you do not try it by the strength of the Sunday School." It has now been proved by the Royal Commissioners as absolutely certain, that the number of worshippers does not depend upon the extent of attendance at our Day Schools. It is the Sunday School which fixes the creed and forms the religious character. I do not say it ought to be so : but that is the fact. By the recent returns it was shown that the Church of England had 76 per cent. of the daily instruction of the country in her schools ; but only 46 per cent. in her Sunday Schools. The Wesleyans contributed 4 per cent. to the Day Schools, but had 19 per cent. in their Sunday Schools ; and the Congregationalists 2 per cent. of daily and 12 per cent. of Sunday scholars. The result was that nearly one-half of the worshipping population belonged to the Non-conformists. It has been said this morning that a large proportion of our Sunday scholars do not become permanent and consistent worshippers in our churches ; but although there is too much truth in that statement, there yet remains a very encouraging remnant. I lately addressed a letter to forty well-known clergymen, friends of my own, in Lancashire and Cheshire, asking what proportion of the operative class who come to the Lord's Table was furnished by the Sunday School, and the answers were for the most part very remarkable. One clergyman said that he had that day led from a little branch school in his parish sixty-nine communicants ; and another wrote that out of 248, the average number of the communicants during last year, 188 were introduced by the school. Most of the letters were equally satisfactory ; but taking the whole, the result was that 70 per cent. of the operatives who came to the Lord's Table were brought entirely by means of the Sunday School. That is a very pregnant and significant fact. It has been stated, as a circumstance telling against Sunday

Schools, that where they had the smallest Sunday Schools they had the largest attendance at church; but the statistics on which this conclusion was based are fallacious. For example, the places where this state of things was the most marked were the two exceptional cities of Exeter and Bath. Exeter has possessed more than sufficient church accommodation from time immemorial; and the population of Bath consists of a very large proportion of retired military and naval officers, and had on the Census Sunday the largest church attendance in the kingdom. Take Manchester and Liverpool, and it will be found that on Census Sunday the latter had a larger church attendance than the former, but a smaller school attendance. From this it was supposed that the Sunday Schools checked what is called "the religious impulse;" but the fact is easily accounted for by the circumstance that one town is commercial and the other manufacturing. In Manchester during the week the factories take the children from their homes, and they earn not only their own living but help to support their parents. Only a few days ago a millowner told me that he employed forty young women as "reelers," who earned an average weekly wage of 22s. 6d.; and it is by no means uncommon to find in Manchester parents living entirely upon their children's earnings—a system whereby parental authority and filial reverence are both greatly diminished. This is not the case at Liverpool where there are no factories. I know Ashton, Oldham, Preston, and the manufacturing districts well, and I am certain that whatever hold the Church of England has upon the operative population, she owes it to the influence of her Sunday Schools. It is sometimes said by Churchmen of Nonconformists, and with much truth, that they get hold of people because they put every one into office; but if they err in that direction, I am sure the Church of England errs in the other. Our Church has lost multitudes who would otherwise have remained within her pale, by not giving them something to do. The best way to get good is to do good; and they are best "watered" who best water others. The number of Sunday School teachers in the land has been estimated at 300,000; and supposing the Church of England has half, she has 150,000 teachers, the very flower of our English artisans and peasantry, her active and attached coadjutors in the work of evangelizing the rising generation. She holds them by giving them something to do; and they are amply compensated in finding by experience that "it is more blessed to give than to receive." I solemnly warn my brethren of the clergy that if they depreciate and neglect their Sunday Schools, they will throw the manufacturing population into the hands of the Nonconformists.

The RIGHT REV. CHAIRMAN stated that Archdeacon Prest, who had undertaken to speak on this subject, was unavoidably absent, and that Dr. Howson had kindly undertaken to supply his place.

The REV. DR. HOWSON: Never was a truer thing said than that which has been said with so much vigour by Mr. Bardsley, namely, that the Church of England is not so strong amongst the operative classes as we should wish it to be, because we do not give the people enough to do. As a resident in Liverpool, I can also confirm what Mr. Bardsley has said as to the necessity of modifying the conclusions drawn from the statistics of public worship. There cannot be a greater difference between two neighbouring towns than between Liverpool and Manchester. In Manchester there is a very large class of intelligent factory operatives; but we have hardly such a thing as a factory in Liverpool. The only corresponding class, that of dock porters, is composed almost exclusively of Roman Catholics; and therefore there is good reason why we should not expect the attendance at church and school to be quite correlative. I purpose to use the few minutes allotted to me in giving some brief reasons why greater attention should be given to one of the topics touched upon by Mr. Jackson, namely, the importance of instructing our people in the services of that Prayer Book which they use every Sunday of their lives. In giving instruction in those services, we give instruction in regard to an immense amount of doctrine. For instance, take the prayer of St. Chrysostom, and you will see how much doctrine may be involved in a single collect. But in this way we do not teach doctrine in the dry, abstract form so repulsive to children, but doctrine in connexion with devotion. And instruction so given may be expected to have a great effect upon the lives of those who receive it. To teach doctrine in this way will give the children a great interest in the prayers themselves. I lay stress on the daily services, since children come but little into contact with the occasional services of the Prayer Book. The mischief arising from familiarity with sacred things without understanding them is greater than is commonly supposed. The services are used about 100 times a year by those children who attend church, and, whether they understand the meaning or not, they become familiar with the words. They are forced to attend, but too often they have

not been taught to understand the meaning of the service; and they naturally grow weary of it, and are the more easily attracted to places where the excitement is greater. We have reached a period when we cannot retain our people by mere routine; and unless their attachment to the Church be based upon intelligence it will not continue. The subject too may be viewed in another light; its connexion with ritualism. The external attractions of an ornamental service may draw persons into our churches; but our children should be carefully taught the real meaning of that which they are to use all their lives. There may be much or little music—there may be simple or gorgeous dresses—but without knowledge, these will form but a gratification of the senses. Instruction of this kind has a tendency to bind together all ranks of life; for the same kind of teaching is applicable to all the different classes of society. A great deal has been said about the children of the poor, but the children of the richer classes—yes; and their fathers and mothers too—are by no means always well informed as to the meaning of the services in which they are engaged. Sometimes curious revelations are made as to the utter ignorance on these subjects of persons in the better ranks of society. Nothing is more likely to induce the elder members of a family to make themselves acquainted with the meaning of the services than giving instruction to the younger members of the family. And lastly this instruction should be given, because it will materially increase the interest taken in all other instruction, whether in the family at home, or at the Sunday School, by means of catechizing in the Church, or in sermons from the pulpit. Having said this, I will not detain you with any suggestions as to the methods to be used in carrying out this plan of instruction. Those methods will be discovered and be more or less effective according to the wisdom, discretion, and perseverance of the teacher.

EARL NELSON: As the subject for discussion involves a particular sphere of lay agency to assist the clergy, I think it right that a layman should say something about it. I am strongly impressed with the importance of Sunday Schools for forming a mode of assisting the clergy in a most useful and marked manner. But there are two points in particular to which I would allude, and which have not been mentioned, which give rise to objections, and are calculated to damage the influence of Sunday Schools for good. The first is, the risk run under the present arrangements of wearying the children, who, after being some time at school, are then taken to the church to remain through an aggregate of accumulated services. As we are in the province of York, I am reminded that it was Archbishop Grindal (though he was also connected with Canterbury) who did much to raise the difficulty of which I am complaining. He went round and ordered everywhere, that there should be no pause (as there had been till then) between the different services, because he did not like to see the people going in and out of church. Now, it would be a good thing if we could go back, so far as the Sunday Schools are concerned, to the old system put down by Archbishop Grindal; and allow the children to leave the church, say after the Litany, and go back to the schoolroom, where they might, if necessary, be detained during the rest of the time, but occupied in some other way. A great deal would thus be done to make the Sunday School less wearying to the children. The second point I would mention is, that I fear we are bringing into the Sunday School too much secular instruction. I should like to say a word affecting this point in respect to adult instruction. The difficulty of evening or night schools is having in them grown-up people who, from necessity or past neglect, require secular instruction. For their sakes the clergy shrink from bringing in the bigger boys from the Sunday School, and thus the sections that ought to be the stamina of the night schools are excluded. My idea is that the children who leave the day schools should not be lost sight of, but should be kept under the eye of the clergy by means of evening schools; which, if they were held only once or twice a week, and for only half an hour if more could not be done, would induce parents to be anxious for their children to attend and keep up their knowledge gained in the day school; and the teachers then would not be tempted as now to bring secular knowledge into Sunday School teaching.

MR. GEORGE WARINGTON: I feel that some words of apology are due from so young a man as myself in venturing to address a Church Congress—but as a Sunday School teacher myself, and as representing here the Church of England Young Men's Society, which numbers some thousand teachers among its members, it may not be considered out of place if I say a few words on the practical working of Sunday Schools. The remarks of Mr. Jackson as to the good effects of Sunday Schools in leading persons to become attached to the Church and partakers of her ordinances are well borne out by facts; and if time permitted I could give further, similar statements of such results. I wish however but to make two remarks. The first is with regard to

the incompetency of teachers. No doubt the great complaint of the clergy is that their teachers are not competent to a proper discharge of their duties. They are generally not deficient in the matter of piety or of information, but the great fault is as to method. They do not master the weapons they have to use. It is no doubt a difficult matter to instruct Sunday School teachers on such points; but there is one way which has been tried and found to answer admirably, and that is the system of training classes. In these classes a teacher gives a lesson to a class aloud, before his fellow teachers, and when it is concluded the children are dismissed. Those present then give their opinion upon the lesson; remarking freely on the way in which it was given, and finding fault with it where it was defective. By this means the teachers present are taught their own shortcomings and faults; while those who give the lessons discover faults where they did not think any existed. The critics and the teacher are thus both benefitted. Training classes of this kind are carried out on a large scale in London and are found to be most useful and beneficial. The other remark I wish to make is with regard to the propriety of taking the younger children to church. I agree with Dr. Howson that they should be instructed in the service of the Church; but how are we to begin with the younger children? To explain all the hard words only would be a hopeless task; but they cannot enter into the service heartily unless they understand it. What then is to be done? If they are taken to church they get into a habit of not taking part in the service. Would it not be better to keep them in a schoolroom and have a suitable service for themselves; including singing, prayer, and a short lesson which they could understand? In this way they would be trained for public worship, and when old enough to go to church, would be instructed in the idea of service and become intelligent worshippers.

The Rev. B. DOUGLAS, of Pennsylvania: The Sunday School is a most important institution and across the Atlantic it has had a fair trial. It is looked upon as a most important work, and 999 out of every thousand episcopal clergymen in America would say "we will rather dispense with our Church than our Sunday School." The great idea on the other side of the Atlantic is that the Sunday School ought to be the nursery of the Church, and it, therefore, has the greatest attention paid to it. Many of the difficulties that have been mentioned have been experienced by us. You may have children come to Church at least once a day and enter into the service, but they require previous preparation and instruction. There is also a necessity for special instruction in doctrine. Sermons are generally addressed to adults; but the Gospel must be preached to those who will become adults. I confess it is hard work to address children, but it must be done if we are to get the children to love our Church. In America, however, we do not begin by sending them to Church and letting them sit through a long service. We have a liturgy for Sunday Schools, so that the children glide from one into the other as a matter of course. The great want in the Sunday Schools here appears to me to be distinctive church teaching. I lately had an interview with a gentleman who has been for forty years a Sunday School teacher, and who has been the means of gathering thousands of the young into the Church of Christ; and he is now employed in the evening of his days in arranging for the use of Sunday Schools a complete set of questions upon the Gospels and Collects and other parts of the Prayer Book. I trust the Church of England will cling to its Sunday Schools; and when this country sends to us the overflow of its teeming population they may be devoted sons and daughters of the Church of our Fathers.

Mr. J. G. FITCH: There are two or three points mentioned by previous speakers which have long been subjects of consideration with me, and I therefore venture briefly to say a few words on them. One of these points was briefly alluded to in the extremely suggestive paper by Mr. Jackson, and it has received rather less time and attention than was due to it. He referred to the importance of selecting the Sunday School teachers, whenever possible, from among young people of higher social rank. At present most of the teachers are drawn from the same class which furnishes the scholars. It is satisfactory, no doubt, to find that the old pupils become anxious to be employed as teachers of others; but it should not be forgotten that the moral influence and weight with which instruction is given by them are far less than those derived from the personal presence and sympathy of more educated persons. No doubt, it is far more difficult to obtain teachers of the higher class; but I am convinced that any effort or pains spent in obtaining their services would be more than repaid by the result. It might be worth while to consider whether the demand made upon the time of a teacher on Sunday is not so great as to deter many from the work who are highly qualified, and who are willing to be useful. To be in a Sunday School at half-past nine in the morning, to attend service with the

scholars, and to resume class-work at two in the afternoon, make up a laborious day; and although young people engaged in manual labour throughout the week, not unfrequently find in it a relief, from its very contrast with their daily life; it is very different with those engaged in occupations, in which thought is much required. Would not many persons of superior education be prepared to teach, *either* in the morning or the afternoon, if they were invited to do so; and were not expected to attend both parts of the day? I know how difficult it is to organize a school with relays of teachers; but if by this means a better class of agents could be attracted to the work, the experiment would be worth trying. More pains should be taken by teachers in the preparation of lessons, and classes of teachers should be occasionally formed for the systematic study of the subject, as well as for the friendly discussion of the best methods both of teaching and of discipline. Some training classes which I have seen at work in London have been attended with the happiest results. They have been the means of directing the attention of the teachers to the best sources of information, and to the best mode of preparing, arranging, and illustrating their lessons. And they have also done much to encourage a better style of questioning, and more judicious methods of handling and managing the classes. A good deal of labour is, of course, needed on the part of the clergyman to get teachers' classes formed occasionally for this purpose; but experience proves that all such labour is well bestowed, and that it produces increased interest on the part of teachers in their work, and greater order and efficiency in the school.

The Rev. W. CAINE: I have been a teacher twenty-six years; and the great danger connected with Sunday Schools is, to my mind, that of making the parents consider the teachers, and not themselves, responsible for their children's religious instruction. To prevent this the best course would be to get the children to sit with their parents in church on Sundays. It would bring parents to church in order to take care of their children; and the children would escape the temptations to play when put into a distant gloomy gallery. I have some marvellous statistics as to what becomes of Sunday School children. The grand obstacle to their future welfare is the public-house and the gin palace, which send immense numbers of them to our gaols. In the prison, in the town of Leeds, out of 230 prisoners 180 had been scholars in Sunday Schools; and you will be still more astonished when I tell you that 23 had actually been Sunday School teachers. These are startling facts. I would, therefore, suggest that we ought to take pains to remove this temptation out of their way, especially on the Lord's Day. In Manchester 212,243 visits were carefully noted as having taken place to these places on a particular Sunday, and 22,000 of them were actually paid by children. Enticements are held out by publicans for Sunday School children to go to their houses. I have heard Mr. Bardsley state that one Sunday evening when walking home from service from his church he heard the beautiful voices of children singing in a public-house. He went in and found that several of them were children of his own school who were employed by the publican to sing in order to entice unhappy drunkards into his house. There is another fact of importance connected with this subject. It is believed with good reason that one out of every six or seven becomes in after life a drunkard, and ought we not therefore to use every effort to save our children from such degradation, and to remove such temptations out of their way. The labours of a clergyman are like those of Sisyphus in the heathen mythology—he is continually trying to roll the stone to the top of the hill only to have it hurled back again by these abominable temptations placed in the way of Sunday School children. I would earnestly commend to my brother clergymen two admirable publications levelled against the demon of drink—"The *British Workman*" and "the *Band of Hope Review*." They are now greatly circulated even by clergymen who are not teetotallers, as publications well calculated to promote not only the cause of temperance but the spiritual and moral and social welfare of the poor in every possible way. I have been a teetotaller thirty years—I am proud to be a teetotaller—and I hope to live to see the day when the principles of total abstinence will be widely spread throughout the Church of England.

The Rev. JOHN FIELD (Rector of West Rounton): It is not my intention to trespass on your time at any length on the points which have been already so well handled by the noble lord and the gentlemen who have spoken. With regard to the danger of wearying the children by their attendance at the prolonged services of the church on Sunday morning, I may mention that the evil may be avoided not only by having in some cases a short service for children, to which reference has been made; but by their departure from the church at the close of the Litany, which is the practice in my parish. I do feel most strongly that if we oblige the children to attend our Church service from the beginning to the end, we take the best means to weary

them and make them dislike the service. It is the very nature of man to hate that put upon him by force. We should therefore try to render our services as attractive as we can. I cannot agree with the statement of the last speaker, that so many of those committed to prison have been Sunday scholars, or that many of them have been teachers. A very long experience as the Chaplain of a large Prison, and for several years as a Visiting Magistrate of the Prisons in the North Riding, inclines me to quite a different opinion; and certainly the statistics of these prisons contradict the statements that have been made. With reference to other statistics, I desire to increase the number of Sunday scholars, but I do not wonder that so large a proportion of children attend Wesleyan schools. There are very many of the children of the Church of England seduced and kidnapped from our Sunday Schools. I will mention a plan pursued in the rural districts by the degenerate disciples of John Wesley, and what he I am sure would have deprecated; and that is, they encourage children to get up pieces of poetry and, dressed in theatrical style, to recite them on a stage in their chapels in the presence and amidst the plaudits of the congregation. I cannot conceive anything more likely to produce vanity and pride in these children and to entice those who naturally love display and flattery of this kind, from other schools. While I hope the number of our Sunday scholars may be increased, I think it more important that those whom we do instruct be so taught as that, by God's blessing, they become sincere Christians and sober-minded members of our own Church.

The RIGHT REV. CHAIRMAN then pronounced the Benediction.

CONGRESS HALL. WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON.

His Grace the PRESIDENT in the Chair.

LAY AGENCY IN THE CHURCH'S WORK.

THE RIGHT HON. EARL NELSON READ THE FOLLOWING PAPER.

DR. PUSEY in his "Eirenicon," which was published during the week of our last Church Congress, at Norwich, bears a noble testimony to the increasing power and vitality of the Church of England.

Eirenicon, Page 280, 281:—

"Increased zeal for spreading the faith of Christ abroad returned into the bosom of the Church at home. Increased zeal for the religious education of the poor won the blessing of Jesus, whose bequest the poor are; Increased efforts to build Churches to the glory of His name, and for the salvation of souls, were blessed by the increased presence of Him in whose honour they were raised.

Not in one way, nor in one set of ways, but in all; not in one class of minds, but in some of every class; not in one theological section of the Church, but in all; not through one set of men, but through all; not through those only who had our full belief, but through all who loved Him; not through prosperous circumstances only, but yet more through adverse; not in England only, but throughout the whole body, has God been forming the Church of England, for what purpose in His hands He knoweth."

And I believe with him that God has been in a marvellous way preserving, reforming, and purifying our Church, that she may be ready to carry out His work among us in this our day. We must not, however, bask lazily under the sunshine of past success, but be up and doing, ready and anxious to perform His will.

Surely in this age of increasing knowledge, when fresh discoveries and new inventions meet us at every turn, the Church is called to higher duties; all these things must be sanctified to God's use, and the additional powers thus given should enable us to fulfil and carry out Christ's law of love in a larger spirit than it was ever acted upon before.

To this end our Christian brotherhood must not only be increased by the propagation of the faith throughout the world, but all, both clergy and laity, should seek by mutual labour to renew their strength and to stimulate and keep alive the influences of God's Holy Spirit, in the heart of every member of the body.

The Church ought to be a reality in every parish: a Christian Brotherhood, foremost under their parish priest in the suppression of vice, in the amelioration of misery, in the furtherance of all Christian virtues. But to be this effectually I hold, with an unknown author, "that a flourishing Church requires a vast and complicated organization which should afford a place for every one who is ready to work in the service of humanity."

Thus should we see Lay agency in full operation. Thus would be stirred up and kept alive in each one of us the holy flame of Christian love.

I am anxious to enforce the following proposition:—

That in the present phase of Christianity, when the world and the Church are so mixed up together, it is essential that a Christian laity, whether men or women, should be specially called by authority for special lay work in the Church.

1. That we may attain to a nearer likeness of those Apostolic days when clergy and laity as one body laboured together in carrying out, each in their respective callings, the Work of Christ.
2. As a witness, on the part of the Church, to the duty of lay work for Christ, which no desultory work without authority can effectually be.
3. That the line of distinction may be clear to the people between laymen ministering by the authority of the Bishop, and dissenting teachers, who aspire without authority to the priestly office.

1. In the account of the first Christians, the Scriptures reveal to us an united body labouring together with the common object of pressing forward the work Christ had given them to do. And in later times, when the heathen Empire of Rome had crumbled before the leaven of Christianity, and when lukewarm professors outnumbered real Christians, the Church, ever mindful of her children, sought to preserve the working of Apostolic days. By the institution of the minor orders, and the formation of brotherhoods and sisterhoods, she obtained additional power to meet the increasing calls upon her: and at the same time afforded an opportunity for the earnest-minded among the laity to continue their work for Christ in joint action with the clergy, under the direct sanction of the Church.

For I hold the minor orders to be entirely distinct from the three great Orders of Bishop, Priest, and Deacon. There is no sufficient evidence to show that they were of Apostolic origin. And they have in no way encroached upon the distinctive rights of the three great Orders of the Church. We may, perhaps, except from this general statement, the order of Deaconesses, by granting to them Apostolic origin and the imposition of hands, but this would go to prove my statement as to the essentially *lay* character of minor orders from the beginning, for none, except among the heretics, ever contended that

this consecration gave the Deaconesses any power to execute the sacerdotal office or do the duties of the sacred function.

While as regards the other orders we find the custom of different Churches was diverse, some ordaining to them with imposition of hands, others appointing Catechumens to fulfil them.

And though by some Churches they were considered indelible, this can in no way be shewn to have been inherent in the orders themselves, but rather a consequence of their having afterwards become a school or preparation for the higher Orders of the ministry.

St. Ambrose bears witness to their lay character, and further shows the real value of these offices for meeting the wants of an increasing population. In his commentary on the Epistles to Timothy he says: "That there is no need to wonder that St. Paul makes mention only of Presbyters and Deacons, for that the other orders were added for the usefulness of their office, which necessity required through the multitude of believers won to the faith by the three Apostolic Orders."

And in further corroboration of this view I insert two quotations from Morinus, a Roman Catholic Theologian who wrote about 1630, and who argues through several long chapters to the effect that the three Orders of Bishop, Priest, and Deacon, are *per se*, as of *divine institution*, essential and unalterable, and that all below (*e.g.* Sub-deacons, Readers, &c.) are not so much *ordines* as *ministeria*, differing radically from the three, and subject to *modification*, according to the needs of Churches.

"Soli hi ordines (Presbyteratus et Diaconatus), majores sunt et apostolico jure sacri. Ecclesia postea Diaconatum, qui implicite continet omnes inferiores ordines et dignitates, sive ministeria, diversimodo explicavit pro populi fidelis multitudine et ecclesiarum opibus."—*Morinus Exercit.* xi.

Again :—

Secundum argumentum, sive secunda testimoniorum classis, petitur ab istorum ordinum, modo unius modo alterius, aut etiam plurium cessatione, additione, diminutione, abnegatione, et reintegratione, quibus manifeste evincitur eos ordines institutionis esse ecclesiasticæ, et posse pro ecclesiæ prudentia aut consuetudine, sicut cæteræ ecclesiæ consuetudines, mutari aut abrogari."

And to the same effect our own Hooker very pertinently says :—

"There is an error which beguileth many who much entangle themselves and others by not distinguishing Services, Offices, and Orders ecclesiastical; the first of which three and in part the second may be executed by the laity, whereas none have or can have the third but the clergy. Catechists, Exorcists, Readers, Singers, and the rest of like sort, if the nature only of their labours and pains be considered, may, in that respect, seem clergymen, even as the Fathers for that cause term them usually clerks.

Notwithstanding, inasmuch as they no way differed from others of the laity longer than during that work of service which at any time they might give over, *being thereunto but admitted not tied by irrevocable ordination*, we find them always exactly severed from that body, whereof those three before rehearsed Orders alone are natural parts."—*Eccles. Pol.* V. lxxviii. 10.

I have ventured thus fully to illustrate this point in support of the argument I have advanced;—that these minor orders were a means of recognising Lay work, and of carrying into a later age, a type of that perfect union between Clergy and Laity, which we find so clearly set before us in the history of the early Church.

And so in the same spirit, the Knights of the middle ages, sanctified by a religious service, went forth on their errands of mercy with the Cross upon their shields, to redress wrong, to succour the helpless.

under a special call from the Church to do Christ's work, by putting down robbery, and oppression in that lawless age.

Again, coming nearer our own time, we find the Reformed Church of England, at one period of her history, recognising the necessity of Lay work. In January 1549—50, the 3rd of Edward VI., an Act was passed which directed the Bishops and others, to issue a reformed Ordinal, providing for the *continuance of the minor orders*, as well as those of Bishop, Priest, and Deacon.

"Be it therefore enacted, that such form and manner of making and consecrating of Archbishops, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, and *other Ministers of the Church*, as by six prelates and six other men of this realm, learned in God's law, by the King's Majesty to be appointed and assigned, or by the most of them, shall be devised for that purpose, and set forth under the great seal of England, before the first day of April next, shall by virtue of the present Act lawfully be exercised."

For as Collier says, "All these," enumerating the minor orders, "seem comprehended in the clause, 'and other ministers of the Church.'"

It does not appear why the Committee drew up ordinals for the three Orders only—thus falling short of their instructions; probably the great impoverishment of the Church at that time made them hopeless of providing for the lesser orders, and the days of voluntary effort had not yet come. At all events, it is a subject for regret that, though lay readers were permitted in the Church, and laymen were appointed to certain other offices, there was no special service by which they were set apart.

The same desire on the part of our Church, can be recognised in the appointment of the office of churchwarden, the duties of which, if rightly carried out in all their details, would include much that lay agency should accomplish. The will so to work is with us still, but it requires to be called into action, and the want of an official recognition of lay agency, to a more general extent, has become one of the chief deficiencies of our Church. The importance of such recognition will be further exemplified by a short summary of the history of our Church as bearing on this subject.

There are many here and there among us, both men and women, who (Thanks be to God!), from an overwhelming sense of duty, or in obedience to the call of their parish priest, do in quiet, hidden ways give themselves up to such a vocation, and become the source of life and blessing to the parishes in which they labour. But we must turn to the different bodies of the dissenters if we would find the lay members of a community, as a whole, taking a vital interest in the spiritual and temporal welfare of their fellows.

Many from true Christian humility shrink from all self-appointed work, and, especially among *laymen*, would consider a more official act than the expressed wish of their parish priest essential to justify them in undertaking such work for Christ. Hence, earnest-minded laymen, finding with us no official call to unite with the clergy in carrying out Christ's work in the world, have been from time to time tempted to join these dissenting bodies. And to the fact that dissenters have from the first in some sort endeavoured to supply this natural yearning of religious minds, must be attributed much of the permanent character of the dissent which we see around us.

The proceedings of the Church of Rome towards Ignatius Loyola, and those of our Church towards the Wesleys have been, I fear too justly, compared to our detriment. We had an opportunity of establishing, through the Wesleys, a well directed system of lay agency under the sanction of the Church. In our coldness, we let them depart, leaving to them the invaluable privilege of supplying, without any corresponding effort on our part, the wants of religious minds among the middle and lower orders of society; who, as a rule, are now excluded, however earnest-minded they may be, from all share in the ministry of our Church.

Is it too much to hope that this great body, driven from us by our coldness, may be re-united now that the warmth of renewed love has stirred up in us increased life and energy, especially if we are prepared to give proof of this renewed zeal by a willingness to meet the want which we have for so long neglected to supply?

I advocate the revival of the minor orders, including that of Deaconesses, or at all events that offices of a similar character should be instituted for organists, singers, school teachers, catechists, and readers, the holders of which should be each set apart by the Bishop for their respective works by a special service; but it is equally important that all these offices should maintain the essentially lay character which they now bear in our Church.

Laymen might be appointed, as in the Jewish Church, to read the Holy Scriptures in the Church Service: and in outlying districts, in cottages, and school-rooms, to conduct a service, where the want of a sufficient number of ordained ministers would, under our present rule, leave the people to the unauthorised lay ministrations of the Dissenter.

And there are many other ways, besides those which the different titles to each office would point out, in which Christ's work may be carried out among us by lay ministrations:—The encouragement of sanitary and social reforms for the benefit of our people:—The instruction in Night and Sunday Schools:—The collection of alms for good works; the visiting the Sick and afflicted.

I purposely abstain from all discussion as to the rules and regulations under which such orders should be appointed, because I know that the question is under the consideration of the proper authorities, and in the revival of the office of Reader satisfactory conclusions have been already arrived at. But I would shortly allude, before I close my paper, to the present position of the question.

That portion of the work under the head of Female Ministrations will be considered in a separate paper. In the furtherance of other lay work, efforts have hitherto been mainly directed to the revival of the minor orders of Sub-deacon and Reader.

The 4th Council of Carthage, A.D. 398, is the standard authority for the essential form of ordination of all orders. I give below the Canon which prescribes the ordering of a Lector or Reader¹

(1) "Lector cum ordinatur, faciat de illo verbum episcopus ad plebem indicans ejus fidem ac vitam atque ingenium, post hæc spectante plebe tradat ei codicem de quo lecturus est, dicens ad eum, 'Accipe et esto Lector Verbi Dei,' habiturus, si fideliter et utiliter impleveris officium, partem cum eis qui Verbum Dei ministraverint."—*Concil. Carth.* : iv., c. viii.

Wherein we see that the essence of the act consists in the *materia*, i.e., the delivery of the Bible, and the *forma*, i.e., the Bishop's charge, "accipe et esto Lector."

Following out the spirit which dictated the original institution of the minor orders, and basing their form of service on the Canon to which I have referred, the Scotch Episcopal Church passed a Canon in 1863, and have acted upon it by the setting apart laymen for this special work.—[See Appendix B.]

The lower House of Convocation in the province of Canterbury, passed the following resolution at the end of their last Session :

"That this House recognising the importance of encouraging lay agency, is of opinion, that the spiritual wants of the Church would be most effectually met by the constitution of a distinct office, such as that of Sub-deacon or Reader, as auxiliary to the Sacred ministry of the Church."

An extensive movement in this direction is being organized in the diocese of London ; and I have been allowed to print in an Appendix to this paper, resolutions unanimously agreed upon at a meeting of the Archbishops and Bishops at Lambeth, on last Ascension Day, and a form of Service which has been already used by the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol in the admission of a layman to the office of Reader, in a parish in his diocese.

This is so far well ; but I trust to see ere long, many lay readers appointed in every diocese ; and not only so, but all lay works for the Church of Christ sanctified by a special recognition and appointment thereto by the Church.

The benefits to be gained are manifold.

1. Those so set apart whether singers¹ or organists, or school teachers, or readers, will be brought to a fuller appreciation of the work they have undertaken, and will feel themselves especially enrolled as one of an active living Christian brotherhood.

2. Earnest laymen will find that the Church at last recognises their yearnings to be fellow-workers with their Parish Priest, for the furtherance and well-being of the Christian commonwealth, and will no longer have to look to other bodies for that call which they feel alone would satisfy the inward longings of their heart.

3. And though in no case would such appointments *necessarily* lead to the full ministry of the Church, the work of the ministry would be mightily strengthened by such recognised co-operation ; while many here and there would show, by surer tests than the most searching examination could secure, their fitness for the full ministry of the Church.

With such a system once in full operation, it would become a comparatively easy matter to re-unite with us (if none other of the dissenting bodies) at all events that great body of the Wesleyans ; who, if faithful to the teaching of their founder, are bound to accept all the Church's teaching, to attend all the Church's services, and only to conduct others at non-Church hours, or in outlying places as our proposed lay readers might be permitted to do.

(1) The Canon for appointing singers is as follows : Concil. Carth. iv., c. x. "Psalmista, id est, cantor potest absque scientia Episcopi, sola jussione presbyteri, officium suscipere cantandi, dicente sibi presbytero Vide ut quod oro cantas, cordo credis, oporibus comprobet."

And thus should we see, even now in this our day, a truer type of the Christianity of the Apostolic age than had before been realised amongst us. Clergy and laity, each in their respective callings, stimulating and building each other up—because with one heart and one mind they would be daily labouring together to carry on their Master's work in the world—striving to do good to all and to bring all to Him, by the exercise of that very law of sympathy, which He Himself has taught us.

THE ARCHDEACON OF LONDON READ THE FOLLOWING PAPER:—

I HAVE to address this assembly on the subject of Lay agency; that is, as I understand the term, on the employment of other persons than Clergymen, in extending the knowledge of Christ's Gospel, in aiding the labours of the Clergy, and in increasing the efficiency of the Parochial system. I should most gladly have declined the task, but having written frequently upon matters connected with this subject, and having had many opportunities of discussing the question with those who are, or who have been, in the highest position in our Church, I feel that I ought not to refrain from publicly stating my opinion respecting the real character of Lay agency, and the course by which it may be adopted in our Church as a branch of the Christian ministry. It may not be out of place to consider what use our Church now makes of Lay agents. The inquiry may show that the Laity are already more closely connected with the ministrations of the Clergy than they are commonly supposed to be, and that according to our law, as well as our religion, the laity and clergy are one.

Though at the risk of causing a smile, I first notice, as an authorized Lay agent, the Parish Clerk. It is known to all who have studied the history of our Reformation, that when the Ritual of our Church was purified from Romish error, and the orders of ministers reduced to those of the Apostolic age, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, the lower orders of ministers were abolished in the simplest manner, by leaving out from the Ordinal the forms by which they might be conferred. The fact may have escaped my notice, but I have not found any mention of any dislike of the lower orders, the Subdeacon, Lector, Exorcist, and Acolyte, prior to their actual disappearance from our Ordinal, as it was compiled upon the death of Henry VIII.; nor can I account in any other way for the ready disuse of them, except on the supposition that the lower orders of the ministry had been practically only steps to the higher (just as the Diaconate now stands in its relation to the Priesthood), and that the new Ordinal was looked upon as only doing away with unnecessary formalities, when it conferred the Diaconate at once, without the ceremony of tonsure or previous admission to the lower orders. But, though deprived of the ceremonial whereby he might be formally made one of the Clergy, the Parish Clerk survived, reduced, in all but his title, to the Lay

condition ; yet permitted to handle sacred things, to attend the Minister in the performance of sacred duties, and to lead the congregation in their part of prayer and praise. How the office of Parish Clerk escaped is not difficult to conjecture. His duty of providing the holy water and carrying it by the side of the priest, of attending him when he carried the Host from the church to the dying or the sick, ceased with the alteration of religion. But as every Benefice had its Incumbent, so every Parish had its Clerk, who, as appears from Ecclesiastical records, had the same right to demand from the parishioners his accustomed fees, as the Incumbent had to demand his tithes. Besides this, without the assistance of some such person, the Divine Service could not be performed according to the Reformed Ritual ; and on the change of religion the Parish Clerk became Subdeacon, Lector, Acolyte, all in one. It is not as a matter of antiquarian interest that I thus notice the Parish Clerk's office, but as a clear instance of Lay agency existing, and for certain purposes recognized, in our Church.

I next notice as Lay agents a large body of men to whose duties as office bearers in our Church much attention has been directed, and pains taken to give a more religious character to the connexion between them and the Clergy—I mean the Churchwardens. In appreciating the services of these Lay agents, I follow the opinions of many Bishops, and of many of my brethren the Archdeacons. Nor can I in this assembly forbear to remind you of endeavours made to combine the whole body of Churchwardens in the defence of the Church, especially in the Diocese of London, by one of the most devoted and loving members of our Church, of whose untimely death, and the loss of his services in the cause of true religion, it cannot be out of place to make mention in a Congress which in some degree owes its existence to his exertions—the late Mr. Henry Hoare. In every parish where he dwelt, he cheerfully undertook the duty of Churchwarden, and, as in all other relations of life, social and commercial, public and domestic, he was a pattern to his equals and contemporaries, so was he in the example which he set to the man of wealth and of business, to the citizen and the country gentleman, of esteeming it a privilege, not less than a duty, to be invested with parochial honour, and showing how much good this Lay agency is able to effect.

Under the head of Lay agency, in its widest sense, and as affecting the welfare and efficiency of our Church, I may also notice the great body of Lay patrons, to whom is committed the privilege of selecting, in so many places, the Incumbent of the church. Lay patronage is surely a Lay agency as well as a sacred trust. Were I to defend the system, I might say that Lay patronage and Benefices are coeval institutions ; that, as Lords of manors, the Abbots and Priors exercised that patronage, which, at the dissolution of the monasteries, passed in a great degree into the hands of the Laity, and that, whenever in the present day a Layman builds a church to the honour of Almighty God, the custom of our forefathers is not improperly followed, which gives to the founder of a Benefice the right of nominating a Clergyman to be maintained in it. I may add that Lay patronage is one of the ties by which the Laity and Clergy are happily bound together.

Hitherto I have considered that kind of Lay agency which our Law recognizes. I am now to look at it in a more popular point of view, and to inquire what help might be rendered by Lay agents to the Parochial Clergy in the care of their parishes and the instruction of the people. I must begin by stating, that as respects the work of the Christian ministry, by which I understand public worship, public instruction, and the administration of the Sacraments, Lay agency is not allowed in our Church. To Priests and Deacons only are those duties committed. The master of the household is encouraged to teach and exhort, and with his family to worship God; and school-masters are required to act as Catechists, to take their scholars to church to hear sermons, and to examine them afterwards as to what they have borne away. But none but Priests and Deacons can celebrate public worship. Of late years a new Lay agency has been introduced, that of Scripture readers and also of District visitors: and hence the question has arisen, whether more extensive use might not be made of Laymen as helpers in the Ministry. I believe that some difference of opinion exists respecting Scripture readers, as they have been found more or less to act in agreement with, and in subordination to, the wishes and directions of the Incumbents; but I think it must be confessed that they have done much good, in showing to multitudes of persons the value and use of the Word of God in the time of sickness and of health, that by their advice and counsel many have learned to pray in private and in public, have been brought back to communion with our Church, and to regard the Clergy of the Parish as their friends and advisers in the concerns of this life and their hope of salvation in the world to come. Not less valuable have been the services of District visitors of either sex. Want has been relieved, the Baptism of young children secured, and many taught in the Day and Sunday School. Industry has been encouraged, intemperance and improvidence checked, and the poor have learned that they are cared for by those above them, and that the kindness shown to them is the blessed effect of that Church of Christ, in which high and low, rich and poor, are members of one body, and bound to love and help each other. It is in the cities and towns that District visiting forms a system. It is not, however, there only that this Lay agency exists, nor perhaps does it in these places produce the most powerful results. In the number of Lay agents we may fairly include the wives, sons, and daughters of the country gentleman and the Parish Priest, who, in their habitual visits to the Farm, the Cottage, and the School, give evidence of that love which Christians have for each other, and of that earnest desire which they who occupy the higher places have to promote the welfare of those who have less worldly advantage than themselves. But their labours of duty and of love are, after all, but personal and private, such as one kind Christian performs for the benefit of another, and which require no other call to undertake them but the impulse of Christian feeling, or any other qualifications but that knowledge of religion and of duty which every well-taught Christian must possess. The ministrations of Scripture readers and District visitors are private and personal, not official or public ministrations.

It is also to the present purpose to observe, that these persons do

not in any way relieve the labour of the Parish Priest ; they cannot help him in any public duty, nor do they lessen his private labours ; quite otherwise : for the more he knows of his people through their agency, the more he finds to be done by himself, in personal conference with those who seek his counsel, in confirming the wavering, directing the erring, and warning those who are going astray. It is a relief to his conscience that he thus knows more of the condition of his flock, but the more they are who are thus restored to the fold, the fewer are his hours of leisure, and the more constant are the demands upon his time and thought. Lay agency renders more necessary, and, I may add, more acceptable, the ministrations of the duly appointed Clergy, but it does not supersede them. These considerations apart, it is also obvious that more persons are required to minister in the public services of the Church by the increase of the population, the growth of towns, the improved condition of the villages, and the requirement of additional services in the churches, both on the Lord's Day and in the week. Laymen cannot supply this want, yet from the Laity must it be supplied.

At times, it has been thought that were the Diaconate much extended, the services which that order is authorized to perform would meet the present necessity ; but unhappily the Deacons, as a body, do not exist. The Diaconate itself is not sought as a distinct office, but as a step to the Priesthood, with no other delay than the probation of a year. The difference between the duties of the Priesthood and the Diaconate are little understood, and still less acted upon. The members of both orders are supposed, as clergymen, to have made the same entire devotion of themselves to religious services, and to be equally bound to withdraw from worldly pursuits. Were it clearly seen that the Deacon does not, like the Priest, engage to devote all his thoughts to the cure of souls, but only to perform certain public duties, such as assisting in the Divine service, and in administering the Holy Communion, in catechizing the youth, baptizing children, and searching for the sick and poor who need relief, and were it also known that the Bishops are not prevented by law from admitting the private gentleman or professional man to Deacon's orders, it is possible that the Diaconate might be accepted by persons willing to continue in it, and who did not consider themselves bound to seek the higher office of Priesthood. Such persons, however, though allowed to pursue some secular occupation, would not be Lay agents : once ordained Deacons they would be clergymen, and forbidden by the Canons "to cease to labour in that calling ;" and the feelings and prejudices of society are hardly likely in this age to be so overcome, as to give much hope of strengthening the ministry by the addition of Deacons of this class.

I come therefore to the conclusion, that the regular appointment of Lay ministers, for the performance of certain definite duties, is the only method by which the Incumbents of parishes can receive real assistance, or the Church avail herself of those offers of service which Laymen of all classes have made. From these persons the Clergy might obtain all the help which the extension of the Diaconate would have afforded, except assistance in the administration of the Sacraments ; there being, on principle, no more objection to Laymen duly

authorized reading the Common Prayer, and conducting public worship in any place where a congregation is assembled, than there is to the commander of a ship acting as the Chaplain and reading prayers to the assembled crew. It is impossible to estimate the good which would follow from multiplying the services of the Church on the Lord's Day in the hamlets of extensive villages, in the spacious rooms of factories in towns, and, I may add, in the recesses of mountainous and thinly peopled districts rarely visited in the week, but never approached by any minister of our Church on the Lord's Day. The office, though conferred publicly and with some ceremony, would not be one of perpetual obligation; neither would it, if properly regulated, give to the Layman a commission to run through the country, or interfere in any other place but that to which he is appointed. As to the finding persons willing to perform such duties there can be no doubt. I have been lately in communication with more than a hundred persons, of all ranks, on the subject, and I gather from them that they represent other hundreds who are waiting to come forward. I observe among many of them a strong feeling that their services cannot be accepted without their giving proof of learning as well as piety, and there have been not a few instances in which I have been asked to point out the course of study which they should adopt. This I could not do, as having no authority in the matter. These facts are not, however, unimportant as showing that if the Lay minister came from a humbler class, he need not be illiterate or uninformed in the history of Revealed Religion, in the knowledge of the Scriptures, the grounds of the Christian Faith, and the distinctive doctrines of our Church as declared in her Articles, in her Liturgy, and in the Creeds.

I have, in the last place, a very delicate duty to perform, that of stating my opinion as to the steps which are necessary for the due recognition of a Lay agency capable of ministering with authority, and strengthening the hands of the Parochial Clergy. The admission of such a Lay agency as is required, is nothing less than the creation of a new kind of ministers. It is useless to disguise the character of the measure or to shut our eyes to it. Now, according to my view of the Ecclesiastical law and the discipline of our Church, no Bishop in his Diocese, nor the collective body of Bishops in the Province, has power to create any new office, or to confer publicly or privately any authority upon any person whatever to minister in the congregation, other than the Ordinal of our Church enables them to do by calling Priests and Deacons to their offices. For any *new* ministry a *new* law is therefore required. I should be sorry to appear presumptuous in thus limiting the powers of the Episcopal Order; but it seems to me that in this age we have need to recall to mind the fact that all the Orders of Ministers are equally bound by law, and limited in their public functions, to such observances, rites, and ceremonies, as our Church retained and established when at the Reformation she rejected the erroneous doctrines and superstitious usages of the Church of Rome. It is no new opinion of mine, that for the establishment of Lay agency a new law is required, and that we cannot have it, except by a Canon agreed upon in the Convocation of both Provinces, and sanctioned by the Sovereign as our Supreme Head in the enactment of the laws by which our National Church is governed. It may be

said, this is impossible ; but how do we know that this is impossible unless we try ? If the Church feels and knows her wants, and the Laity and Clergy agree as to the mode of supplying them, why should we doubt the interposition of Divine Providence on her behalf in a matter which is the subject of hearty prayer to God for aid and help ?

I have now completed my allotted task. Words fail me to express my sense of the responsibility which attaches to the declaration of opinions on such a subject and such an occasion. There is something awful in the thought of modifying the ministry in our Church : it is like venturing to touch the ark of God when it seems to us about to fall. May the Great Head of the Church bless the counsels of this day to the advancement of His own glory, and the preservation of that pure branch of Christ's Church established in this land.

DISCUSSION.

REV. CANON DURNFORD : It is a very old, but equally true saying that the clergy are not the church, and I am sure there is no body more ready to recognize or desirous to enforce that principle than the clergy of the Church of England. And I think further that in proportion as the clergy of the Church of England feel the importance of the peculiar commission with which they are entrusted, in proportion as they feel the immense responsibilities of their high office, in that very proportion are they desirous that all those branches of it that can be shared by the laity should be by them cheerfully undertaken. I have always observed that those clergymen who have the highest sense of their Divine Commission call for lay assistance : and I have observed also that those laity who most entirely recognise the Divine Commission of the Church and the peculiar authority of its ministers, are the most forward in their work of charity and benevolence. Therefore we have our ground laid well. We find the clergy if they understand their commission, perfectly ready to welcome lay fellow labourers ; we find the laity if they understand well their position ready to recognise the peculiar claims and office of the clergy. There is no fear of confusion or collision. It has been said that the Church of England has been neglectful in the matter of lay agency. I do not deny the charge. It is not the only thing in which she has been neglectful. But we must remember the unhappy days of the Georgian era ; we must remember the spirit of slumber that overpowered the land : and how all the ministers in Church and State only made it their business to administer opiates. That was the real condition of the Church of England, and from it they were awakened by two mighty prophets of that day—Whitfield and Wesley. It is almost impossible to conceive that the Reformers of our church—those enlightened and almost inspired men must not have felt as much as we do the necessity of lay-co-operation. Doubtless they did feel this, and we have read that Archbishop Parker was most desirous to re-establish in the Church the ancient order of Readers, proposing in his own day to do that which three Archbishops and 17 Bishops at Lambeth thought should be done for the Church of England at the present day. What was the objection ? I differ with reluctance from so great an authority as Archdeacon Hale, but I do not think it was because the lower orders lead by steps to higher orders, that the prelates and reformers of that day failed to secure the co-operation of lay readers ; but because the whole ecclesiastical system of friars and all who partook of the character of friars were such a leagued militia of the Church of Rome, that to have engaged them in that service would have been to sap the foundation of the Reformed Church. Be this as it may, whatever assistance our Church has received from the laity—and it has received the greatest possible assistance—it has been an unauthorized one—one suggested by their own consciences, by the Spirit of God speaking within them, and in no respect sanctioned, scarcely countenanced by the rulers of the National Church. We have learnt a great lesson in this particular, and like other lessons we have learnt it very much from our Sister Churches. We have learnt it from those colonies that have been violently, by the act of their legislature separated from the State and thrown upon their own resources : we have learnt it from

the mighty sister Church of America, which in the midst of its republican institutions, felt the necessity of entire self-reliance and self-sacrifice: and I would ask you had it not been for the assistance of the laity in their several synods, where at this moment would have been the Church of America and our Colonies? Would it have been possible to effect that organization which now prevails, and which by the happy intercourse of clergy and laity providing for the mutual rights of both, secures an adequate and safe maintenance for all its ministers, and the entire co-operation of the entire body of the Church to every good and beneficent purpose. That is the state of the Colonial Church, and something of that kind I believe we shall by degrees come to in the Church of England. It was shadowed forth in that admirable and loving sermon we heard from the Archbishop of Canterbury, it was also alluded to in the opening address of the President. It was clear that far-sighted man saw the time must come when the laity would take their part not only in the charitable work of the Church, but also in the synods and legislative assemblies of the Church. I think it does great credit to his sagacity that he should have foreseen the tendency which is in point of fact inevitable. We come now to this point, how we may utilise the zeal of Christian persons coming as lay agents in the service of the Church? There are two sorts of agencies. There are voluntary agents, and stipendiary agents. We desire that both of these should have some commission and authority from our spiritual rulers. We desire this in the case of our stipendiary agents—such as our Scripture readers—who give their whole time to the service. They should go forth to the people of the diocese duly accredited from its Bishop with something more than a paper in their pocket. And those who know most of lay agents will grant such a commission is by no means unnecessary. Great indeed is the good they have effected and are effecting; great are the sacrifices these men are daily making; but still instances there are, and not a few where they have been found to raise cabals and animosities in parishes, and have not been altogether that dutiful class of ministers the clergy would desire to have. Such is the fact: and it is not surprising that some should not understand the position in which they are placed. In the case then of the stipendiary agents, namely, the Scripture readers, it is extremely desirable there should be a solemn service, and that from the Bishops they should receive such a *quasi* ordination as to give them power among the people whom they are to teach. But it is different in the case of those who cannot afford the whole of their time. These people are above all praise, and if they come to the Church and say it will be the greatest refreshment to them if the rulers of the Church will give them the authority and commission which they are desirous to possess—surely they cannot be refused the qualified commission they ask? But whether the service already suggested is altogether satisfactory and sufficient it will be left, I am sure, to the wisdom of the united Episcopacy to decide. That is one of the things in which we cannot here intermeddle. When the matter comes to be maturely considered we must adopt the alternative of an application from the two Convocations, first to the Queen and then to the two houses of Parliament, to make such Canons as may be needed to meet the emergency. I think that will probably be the upshot of the business, for the sort of half measure now proposed will scarcely satisfy the hearts and consciences of those who seek even a qualified commission. The noble lord—an illustrious specimen himself of the sacrifice and labours of the laity—referred in hopeful terms to a possible reunion with the Wesleyan body. I am sure from my heart I desire unity. All of us here wish we could be no longer an isolated body: We desire as much as possible to include within our fold all who will accept our services and agree heart and soul to our formularies: but I am afraid the noble earl's sanguine temperament carried him a little too far. I fear the Wesleyan organization is too deeply rooted in the hearts of that people. I fear they have too many separate interests ever to forsake their own peculiar Church, as they call it, and to become a part of our own. I fear the separation is total. Unless there come some special act of Providence it never can be removed. (No, no.) Are those who cry "no no" aware of the conditions under which local preachers act? I suppose the local preacher most nearly answers to that sort of lay agent who is to be sent into our towns, villages, and scattered hamlets, to teach and read and preach under the sanction of the Bishop. It is exactly what the local preacher does under the sanction of the Wesleyan superintendent. What are the qualifications of the local preacher? First of all he must have a burning zeal—a love for Christ: he must have qualifications to teach and preach: he is then tried on the recommendation of the superintendent and seeks a conference with him. He is examined as to his conversion and experience and as to his belief of the Wesleyan doctrines and attachment to its discipline. It is commonly said that the doctrines of Wesleyanism and our own are the same. It may

be that the Wesleyan believes all that we believe, but he believes a great deal we should be very sorry to receive as a matter of faith. This is a point upon which we are less informed than we ought to be. The Wesleyan makes it an absolute condition of salvation that a man should have been converted in a particular way and time, and should be able to state his experience of the conversion. (No, no.) But it is so. I ask whether you are prepared to introduce into your schools, and into your rooms and factories, and into your assemblages of Church people, such a doctrine as that? Wherever the Wesleyan goes he must preach that doctrine. It is in his eyes the Gospel: without it there is no Gospel. (No, no.) Aye, but it is so. It is useless for the gentleman to say "no" and me to say "yes." What you have to do is to look at the authorized books of Wesleyan doctrine, or enquire of any qualified Wesleyan, and I am sure I shall be justified. I will say this, that our religion, as I understand it, is something very different from the Wesleyan religion or any other Dissenters' whatever. I believe it is far more serious, deep, earnest, unpretending: I believe it does not seek outward exhibition but practical work. If I had time I would read you what a Wesleyan writes to me as his own experience of local preachers. He says "With regard to lay preachers there is a great lack of supervision of their labour. . . . The plan would work well in the Church of England, as educated men might be employed in parishes to circulate instruction, and not as is too often the case with Wesleyans, ignorant men are sent to village congregations, and they are the only supplies allowed."

FEMALE MINISTRATIONS.

THE EARL OF DEVON READ THE FOLLOWING PAPER:—

BEFORE proceeding, in compliance with the request which I have received, to submit to the Congress a few remarks on "Female Ministrations," it will be convenient, as the title selected by the Committee is capable of very general application, to state how it is intended to deal with the subject. I propose then to treat of such "ministrations" only as are carried into practical effect by societies or bodies formally constituted, regulated by certain definite rules, and working for certain definite objects; and to abstain from referring to the numerous and noble instances, which history and daily experience present, of the exertions of females as individuals in the cause of religion or of charity. Within the range thus limited, I would further define the course which I propose to take, by saying that I shall endeavour

1st. To trace very briefly the history of organized female ministrations in connection with the Church down to the period of the Reformation.

2ndly. To give an account of some of such organized societies of women as have since existed and now exist, whether in connexion with the Church of England, or in some other Protestant bodies; and

3rdly. To indicate, and illustrate by examples, the benefits which such societies are calculated to produce, remembering at the same time to point attention, as far as may be requisite and practicable, to the dangers against which it is necessary to guard, and to the conditions under which their usefulness may be most widely extended.

In dealing with each of these heads, I desire preliminarily to acknowledge the essential assistance which I have derived from a work entitled "Woman's Work in the Church," by John Malcolm Ludlow, a treatise which contains in a condensed form all the leading facts connected with the historical portion of the subject.

1st. Referring then, for my authority and for much fuller detail under the first head of my subject, as well to the book above-named as to the valuable work of the rev. gentleman who is to follow me, and to whose learning and ability I look with confidence to supply my many shortcomings, I would begin by calling attention to the fact which seems to be established by adequate evidence, that, from the time when St. Paul in the 16th chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, wrote commending to them "Phœbe our sister, which is a servant of the church which is at Cenchrea, and a succourer of many and of myself also,"—for the first two or three centuries of the Church's history, there existed as part of the Church system a female Diaconate, the members of which probably received in many cases ordination at the hands of the bishops, and were employed in ministering to the temporal wants of the female members of the congregation, and in performing certain offices connected with the baptism of women, and with their position in God's house during public worship. "The latter half of the fourth and the former half of the fifth centuries form," says Mr. Ludlow, "the period during which the female Diaconate of the East appears to have attained its highest importance. All the leading Greek fathers and Church writers of the age refer to it, and notices of individual deaconesses become frequent in Church annals, while everywhere the female Diaconate is spoken of as an honourable office, and one filled by persons of rank, talent, and fortune." At the same time, however, there seems reason to believe that even as early as the fifth century it had lost somewhat of its primitive practical character, and that there was a gradually increasing tendency to the substitution of religious contemplation and observances of an ascetic character for attention to external duties and works of charity. In the Western Church, the traces of the existence and practical working of a female Diaconate are much less numerous and marked than those which occur in the East, and there also the growing tendency to a cloistered life seems to have at first materially modified the institution, and ultimately in effect superseded it. Though it is stated that some vestiges of the office of Deaconess may be traced to a later period, still it may perhaps be said with sufficient accuracy that it had become practically obsolete in both branches of the Church by the ninth century. For some centuries afterwards, the gradual development of the monastic system, applicable to women as well as to men—a system, the germs of which may, it is said, be discovered as early as the fourth century,—formed the most prominent element in the religious life of the age. To the establishments thus created we owe doubtless the preservation of such learning as survived the confusion of the earlier portion of the middle ages, and we should be especially unjust were we to deny to them the praise of having done much to maintain alive the flame of religious fervour during ages of darkness and violence. It seems not improbable, however, that as the conventual rules became from time to time more strict (and I desire to confine my observations only to monastic institutions for females), there was an increasing number of devoted Christian women who, however willing to employ themselves with the utmost zeal for God's service, yet shrunk from the seclusion or the austerities of a monastic life. To the existence of this feeling may naturally be ascribed the growth of the *Béguine* Sister-

hood, an institution traceable, says Mosheim, as referred to by Mr. Ludlow, in Germany and Belgium as early as the tenth century. Derived, it is said, from the Teutonic "beg" or "pray," the term "Béguine," or praying woman, is said to have been used then to designate "widows or young unmarried women, who without renouncing the society of men, or the business of life, or vowing poverty, perpetual chastity, or absolute obedience," yet led, either at their own homes, or in common dwellings, a life of prayer, meditation, and labour. In the thirteenth century these sisterhoods (and brotherhoods, also, on the same plan) flourished greatly. "As soon," proceeds Mr. Ludlow, "as a Béguinage became at all firmly established, there were almost invariably added to it hospitals or asylums for the reception and maintenance or relief of the aged, the poor, and the sick. The sisters received, moreover, young girls chiefly orphans, to educate, went out to nurse and console the sick, to attend deathbeds, to wash and lay out the dead. In France and Germany, the Béguinage usually consisted of a single house, distributed into separate cells, but with a common refectory and dormitory. In Belgium, on the contrary, as we may see still, there were nearly as many small houses as there were sisters (thus recalling the cloistered hermitages of the early monks), the largest and highest building being devoted to common purposes, and including particularly the chapel, the hospital, and the infirmary for sick sisters."

The relation of the Béguine movement to the monastic institutions of the Church of the middle ages, presents many points of great interest as well to the historical inquirer as to all who desire to study the feelings and actions of men. To dwell on it in detail would be at once an unnecessary and impertinent repetition of what has been much better done elsewhere, and a course inconsistent with the prescribed limits of the present paper. One observation, however, it is obvious to make, in reference to what became in fact a struggle between monastic institutions and the Béguine movement, viz., that while the latter was discountenanced and opposed by the advocates of the more exclusive and rigid rules of the former establishments, insomuch that the canons of more than one Council and the bull of more than one Pope was directed against them, the heads of more than one religious order themselves recognised the principles of the Béguine associations, and in more perhaps than one instance established in connexion with their order a subordinate class, bound by less stringent vows, and devoted to similar duties to those performed by the Béguines. Such were the Tertiarian Nuns of the Franciscan Order, and the Hospitaller Nuns of Paris and other parts of France, whose mission, as has been said, is simply told in the words of the beautiful vow of the Hospitaller Nuns of Pontoise: "To be all their life, for the love of Christ, the servant of the sick poor, so far as in them lay, to do and to hold until death." It would be matter of much interest, did time permit, to reproduce here the history (which is to be found, however, in more than one book already published) of the various establishments which from time to time arose in the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth centuries, having for their object to make the devotional spirit, energy, and patience of Christian women available in connexion with the Church, for ministering to the sick, reclaiming the erring, and in-

structing the ignorant. Especially interesting would it be to dwell on the Sisters of Charity, "servants of the sick poor," an institution established by St. Vincent de Paul in the early part of the seventeenth century, and at the beginning of the eighteenth numbering we are told more than 1500 women in France, Poland, and the Netherlands. Still devoted to, what was at their first establishment a prominent part of their regular functions, the charge of public hospitals, we find them now, in addition, visiting the sick and destitute at their own houses, supporting and managing orphanages, working regularly and heartily in aid of the officers of the several Bureaux de Bienfaisance at Paris, and thus showing the practicability of the systematic combination of voluntary services rendered by persons of a higher class with the labours of paid officials, which might with so much of permanent benefit be regularly engrafted upon our workhouses and asylums. It will, however, be more consistent with the objects of the present assembly, and more conducive to the end which I myself have in view, if I proceed at once to touch briefly on such organized societies of women, as have existed or now exist in connexion with the Church in Protestant countries—my special desire being to fix the main attention of those whom I have the honour of addressing on such institutions as are now existing and working among us in this country. Abstaining then from doing more than simply referring to the statement quoted from Mosheim, that the Bèguines existing at the time embraced almost everywhere the doctrines of the Reformation, and from entering on the question as to how far the secular "Canonesses" of Germany and the Deaconesses of Amsterdam corresponded to the female Diaconate of primitive times, I would advert especially to one institution founded at Kaiserwerth on the Rhine in 1833, because it seems to have suggested the idea and formed the type of similar institutions in this country. Commencing with an establishment for the reception of convicted women on their quitting prison, "the colony, for such it must be called," says a late writer in his account of it, "consists now, in addition, of a hospital, a lunatic asylum for females, an orphanage for girls, an asylum for fallen women, a normal seminary for governesses, a chapel, a residence for the deaconesses, and a home for the infirm." It has also dependent charitable and educational establishments in various parts of the world.

As to the numbers of those by whom this great work is carried on, it is stated, on good authority, that there are now 27 mother houses, with a total of 1203 sisters of different classes. Of the labours of these German deaconesses (I quote from an article in the *Edinburgh Review* of 1848 upon Protestant Sisterhoods), the most interesting feature is perhaps that of parochial activity. "The Commune-deaconess visits the poor and sick at their homes, procures for them as far as possible food and clothing, works for them at her needle, and instructs poor children in sewing and knitting, giving a regular account of her labours to the clergyman, the diaconate, and the ladies' charitable society, where such exists."

But time renders it necessary to pass from the consideration of this noble institution, founded and nurtured up to its present range of usefulness by the zeal and perseverance of a single Protestant pastor and his wife, and to turn our thoughts to similar institutions founded

mainly on that model, and at present existing in this country. Of these, the first established (about 1834) appears to have been the "Institution for Nursing Sisters," in Devonshire-square, Bishopsgate, founded, in conjunction with other ladies, by one whose name can never be mentioned without that honour and reverence which are due to one who was, perhaps, the first to labour in our prisons and hospitals, I mean Mrs. Fry. Several years afterwards, another training institution for nurses was founded in London under the name of St. John's House. The whole of the nursing at King's College Hospital is now and has been for several years, conducted by persons trained in this institution, under the guidance of a lady superintendent; while as well in this hospital as at St. Thomas's, by means of the fund raised in commemoration of the self-devotion, Christian love, and practical judgment of Miss Nightingale, special provision is made for training as nurses others than those who belong to the community. Again, in 1855, St. Margaret's Home at East Grinstead was founded, and an order of sisters established, who "going out into the cottages of the out-of-the-way villages, should live among the poor in their own homes, nursing them gratuitously in any diseases, but more especially in those contagious fevers, when even money will hardly purchase an attendant." In the course of the year 1864, it should be added in illustration, that the sisters were placed in charge of three towns—Caistor, Hitchin, and Baldock—under very severe and wide-spread visitations of fever. This especial work of mercy has, it should be stated, subsequently ramified into several others, as an orphanage and a school for clergymen's daughters. Before this period institutions having for their special object (at least at first) another of the works of charity contemplated at Kaiserwerth, were established, viz., the House of Mercy at Wantage, and that at Clewer, from which has now sprung a kindred institution at Bovey Tracey, in Devonshire, for the reception and reformation of fallen women. The Sisterhood of Mercy at Devonport, too, was founded about the same time, or perhaps earlier, and appears from the commencement to have been designed not merely for penitentiary work, for nursing the sick, and for the care of orphans, but also for training young women as servants, for the maintenance of day schools, and for ministering to the physical wants of the poor. As years passed on, other institutions were founded having a wider range of operation than those at first established, and in the House of Mercy at Ditchingham, the Hospital of St. Mary at Brighton, the Mission Sisters at Wymering, near Portsmouth, St. Peter's Home and Sisterhood at Brompton, and the Sisterhood of St. Thomas at Oxford, we find nursing, the education of the poor, the special care of orphans, all alike recognised as the fitting field of action for female ministrations.

Two other institutions, having similar objects, ought not to be omitted, viz., one the North London Deaconesses Institution, founded, as stated in the paper describing its origin and purposes, "for the organization of women's work in the Church of England, and the renewal of the ancient and primitive order of Deaconesses," to be employed in visiting the sick, instructing the young, and ministering to those who are gathered in hospitals, prisons, and asylums; the other, All Saints Home in Margaret-street, Cavendish-square, under

the sanction, as is the Deaconesses' Institution, of the Bishop of London. Of this institution, I take an account from a printed statement which has been placed in my hands: "The works in which the sisters of the All Saints Home are engaged are various. They teach in the night schools of the district, visit and nurse the poor and sick of the district at their own houses; they take charge of orphan girls; receive into the Home aged and infirm women, incurable sick men and women, and young girls." They have the entire charge of the nursing of University College Hospital, and have also a limited number of nurses who attend the sick in private families. I cannot omit to add (and I mention this with special pleasure, as at once an example of a great benefit to the sick poor in workhouses, and a proof of the just appreciation by an influential body of the services of devoted women) that the whole nursing of the Chorlton Union Workhouse, near Manchester, containing about 500 inmates, is now placed in the hands of the sisters of All Saints Home; the guardians having requested them to undertake the charge during a severe visitation of fever, when there was a panic among the paid nurses.

Before closing these brief and imperfect references, I desire to advert to another institution, through which female ministrations are systematically brought to bear upon the poorer classes of the community,—I mean the Parochial Mission Women. To dwell at length upon this institution, twice already brought under the notice of the Congress, once by the Rev. Wellington Furse in 1862, and again in 1863 by Vice-Chancellor Sir W. Page Wood, would be at once unnecessary and impertinent. None who are acquainted with these papers will forget the clear account given of its origin, nature, and mode of working, or the eloquent terms in which it was pointed out: how, in order to obtain access to the "homes and hearts of the poor" (I quote from Sir W. P. Wood's paper), the employment of women selected from their own rank in life would be found to supply the fittest agency. To those, however, not acquainted with those papers, it may properly be explained that in the year 1860, acting upon an example recorded in the "Missing Link," an interesting work which had appeared shortly before, four ladies, members of our Church, endeavoured to avail themselves of the agency of poor women as mission women, by means of a society of which they became the managers. Working in strict connection with and subordination to the parochial system, the society, if requested by the incumbent of any parish, and if certain funds are provided locally, aids in placing and maintaining a mission woman, herself selected by the clergyman from the ranks of the poor, and working under a lady also named by him, whose influence, advice, and example may be instrumental in the promotion of habits of cleanliness, economy, order, and piety. Experience, I believe, abundantly shows that the founders were right in believing that such influence over the poor is especially likely to be obtained, where the person who goes among them is one who has herself experienced their many wants, endured their many trials, known, perhaps from personal struggles, and overcome the temptations to which they are unavoidably exposed. "She will," it has been well said, "scatter as she goes along many a simple lesson of religion and virtue, while she is immediately instilling in all directions the prin-

ciples, the pleasure, and the power of self-help." It were easy to bring forward testimonies to the value, under ordinary circumstances, of the system to which I now more immediately refer, but I think it better to content myself with quoting only two passages from documents which have been placed in my hands of a special character. One is from the letter of a clergyman of a parish in the East of London, which has been very heavily visited by cholera: "Nothing can have brought into a clearer light the extreme importance of such an agency" (he speaks of the Parochial Mission Women), "than the recent distressing visitation. Our mission women at once rose to the occasion, and, although neither of them physically robust, were enabled by reliance on Divine help to exert themselves most effectually for the relief and comfort of the poor." The other passage which I would wish to quote occurs in a letter addressed to me by a lady, the hon. secretary of the institution: "Many of these humble workers," she says, "have laboured day and night. In Stepney, Whitechapel, Limehouse, Poplar, Bow, West Ham, &c., they have been most useful, and in addition to higher duties have been much valued for their exertions in introducing water, fresh air, chloride of lime, and other requisites into countless rooms, where they have hitherto been strangers."

Of the services rendered by members of those female communities which are organised on a more formal and strict system, proof equally conclusive has been afforded by the recent visitation.

Whether it be in taking charge of temporary hospitals newly opened at Hackney, Wapping, Whitechapel, St. George's in the East, and Ratcliffe; in managing temporary wards in existing institutions as in the House of Charity in Soho, the London Hospital, and the Workhouse of St. George in the East, of which the Sisters of St. John's House took entire charge; or in nursing the poor in their own homes (a work which unquestionably called for the largest amount of self-devotion from the character of the locality in which these services were to be rendered), it cannot be doubted that the zeal, patience, and fearlessness shown by members of the various Sisterhoods who undertook the work, have been instrumental in largely aiding the clergy and the medical men, and under God's blessing in mitigating the bitter sufferings occasioned by the epidemic. Nor, I trust, shall I be deemed to step beyond the proper limits of this paper, if I add from reliable authority that the services rendered by Sisters in the various neighbourhoods referred to above, have on more than one occasion elicited the warm approval of that right rev. prelate who, himself busied amidst scenes of pestilence and death in comforting the sick, cheering the desponding, and ministering to those who were beyond earthly consolations, has been from his observation and experience peculiarly qualified to testify to and appreciate the labours of others.

From the facts which I have thus endeavoured to place before the Congress, it appears to me that two inferences, among others, may be not improperly drawn.

In the first place it may, I think, be concluded that, from the earliest ages of the Church, the importance of female co-operation in ministering to the physical and spiritual wants of the Christian community has been generally recognised.

2ndly. That opportunities and means for making effectual such

female co-operation, are not necessarily confined to any one branch of the Church, but that in *all*, women may render and have rendered most valuable service in promoting the temporal and spiritual well-being of those among whom they labour.

Such service, it is obvious, may be rendered by women, under different conditions, viz., either as individuals, such as, probably deaconesses in the first ages of the Church, and among us in modern times district visitors; or as members of a religious institution, association, or community, such as the *Béguines* of the middle ages, the Sisters of Charity in the Church of Rome, and the various Sisterhoods which exist in connexion with our own branch of the Church. As to the comparative advantages of the two forms of female ministration, opinions may not unnaturally differ, and it may perhaps be admitted that under certain circumstances each may have some special utility. For myself, however, I believe that female ministration is then most systematically and usefully exercised when the persons employed in the work are members of a body associated together, under due superintendence, and from a common sense of Christian responsibility, for common religious and charitable objects. The members of such an association, as it seems to me, have special advantages in the support, comfort, and guidance, which they derive from each other, in the knowledge which they have that the other members of the community are taking a warm interest in the work which they are carrying on, and, I cannot but add, in the recollection that the prayers of many are daily offered up for their well-being and the success of their labours. In saying this, however, I do not conceal from myself that there are certain dangers connected with such associations or Sisterhoods, against which it is necessary to guard. I refer more particularly to the requiring from members anything in the nature of an irrevocable vow, to the adoption of any such marked peculiarity in dress as obviously bears the character of an imitation of dresses worn by nuns in the Church of Rome, and to the enforcement of any peculiar religious observances. The introduction in our Church of such usages creates serious misconstructions, unduly fetters individual liberty, and mars Christian usefulness. The real safeguard, however, against any dangers that may by some be apprehended, from the existence of Sisterhoods, is, the giving them a *practical* character, and treating as their primary regular and permanent duty, active work among the ignorant, the sick, and the erring. Sisterhoods thus employed, under due superintendence and active guidance, will, I venture to add, strengthen the hands of the Church, carry her teachings and consolations to those whom it may otherwise be difficult to reach, and thus aid in large measure in promoting God's work upon earth. Whether, however, it be by Sisterhoods, or by any other form of religious association, it is not to be doubted that a great work of charity and Christian progress may be, and is being, carried on in our Church, a work which if regarded fairly and without prejudice, cannot, I think, fail to be recognised as the best proof of the good which may, under God's blessing, be effected by Female Ministrations.

THE REV. DR. HOWSON READ THE FOLLOWING PAPER:—

THERE is no subject more likely to excite difference of opinion and even disturbance of feeling, than that which is under discussion now. Hence no speakers have a greater claim to forbearance than those who take an active part to-day in this Section.

I will approach the subject by that side which is least likely to offend religious susceptibilities. I will deal at the outset with facts: and I will first say a word on the recent progress of opinion in the Church of England, in regard to the question of female ministrations.

This progress seems to me to amount almost to a revolution of opinion. And though perhaps the strongest evidence of such a fact is precisely that which it is most difficult to bring to the test here—I mean the evidence of common conversation,—yet I think I can enumerate some proofs which will be convincing. First, I may refer to the very large number of books that have been published on this question—commonly small and unpretending books but still very significant—and books of a character quite unknown twenty years ago. Then I think that many persons here present must be acquainted with several, who formerly would have disliked all notion of a systematic female ministry, but are now very favourably disposed to it. I could certainly enumerate such cases among my own acquaintance. And I know those also, who, after taking an attitude of open opposition, are, to their great honour, very ready frankly to co-operate. We find again that this question is now discussed, with very great interest and much seriousness of purpose, at Clerical meetings. And not only is this the case with those voluntary gatherings of Clergy which have no official character, but we see the question formally proposed to Ruridecanal Chapters: and it begins now to be touched in the Charges of our Bishops. As to Church Congresses, I need hardly refer to what took place at Oxford and at Manchester: for many of those who are now present had opportunities then of hearing the question debated by speakers who had a deep sense of its importance. On the whole, I believe it may be said with truth, that among those Clergy who have given attention to the subject, there is hardly any doubt that a systematic feminine ministry of some kind is wanted, not only for Hospitals, for Penitentiaries, for Workhouses, for Orphanages, but for Parishes. Some are content with a Bible Woman, whose excellent exertions are partly combined with the operations of neighbouring Nonconformists; some would prefer a Parochial Mission Woman, paid for her services like the former, and superintended, like her, by some educated lady, but acting strictly within the territorial limits, and in connexion with the stated work, of the Clergyman with whom she is associated; some feel the importance of the higher social station, and the trained service, without a salary in money, which are associated with the term Deaconess; some find it more congenial to their feelings, and more in harmony with their general plans, to use the help which is now so liberally given by highly-organized Sisterhoods, which are almost conventual in their character. But whatever be the preferences of individuals or of parties, the need of something is now very generally felt, which twenty years ago was not even thought of.

Some, no doubt, and very conscientiously, resist any changes of this kind. Some are indisposed to examine so suspicious a novelty. A good many, who appear to be unfriendly, are perhaps considering how they may most gracefully assume a new attitude, after having prematurely committed themselves to the position of antagonism. I think it also important to add (and I do this with the greater pleasure because we have representatives here from our sister Church in America), that the change of opinion which I am describing is not confined to this side of the Atlantic. One of the best publications I have seen on this subject is a report most ably drawn up, after very careful inquiry, in the Diocese of Pennsylvania. I wish this pamphlet were widely circulated in this country. It would remove many prejudices. But prejudices have already given way in a very marvellous manner. And on the whole I believe the question among those who have calmly considered the subject is not, *whether* it is desirable to have a systematic ministry of women, but *of what kind* that systematic ministry ought to be.

This progress of opinion has been brought about, in a great measure, by observation of the necessities of the times and through actual conflict with difficulties. But simultaneously and coincidentally with this change, there has been another change, which ought to engage our serious attention: I mean the change in Biblical Interpretation. People now see in the New Testament something which they did not see some twenty years ago. I will just take one little verse, the 11th verse of the 3rd chapter of the First Epistle to Timothy; and I will merely now refer to the three most distinguished living commentators in the English Church. I need not mention their names before this audience,—one is an Archdeacon, another is a Dean, another is a Bishop;—no one will doubt either their learning or their scholarship, and certainly the characteristics of their books are very different. Few persons, with those commentaries before them, will now say that in that passage the Deacons' wives are intended, or women in general, or will doubt that we have here a clear indication of the parallel Diaconate, in the early Church, of men and of women. Whether such a passage or such a fact constitutes an imperative law for all times is another question. Whether it is "good" now for a man to be "alone" in this kind of Church service, whereas it was not good in the Apostolic times, I must leave to others to say. It is evidently now a growing opinion that it is not good. And surely this Biblical side of the subject is one to which very careful attention ought to be given. Female ministrations occupy a considerable place in the New Testament. Those services during our Lord's earthly life, to which your Grace made an allusion yesterday, were characteristic of the New Dispensation: and it is no wonder if some see in them the germ of the system which grew speedily after Pentecost, and bore flower and fruit. Whether those widows, who are mentioned in the Acts as disturbed (just as we are often disturbed) by party-spirit, were widows officially charged with the administration of charitable funds, I will not inquire; for I am not at this moment giving my own opinions. But the opening of the last chapter of the Epistle to the Romans very naturally suggests the idea that some of those other women who are mentioned in that

chapter, as well as in the Epistle to the Philippians, were ecclesiastical workers in the Church; while certainly there is in the Pastoral Epistles clear evidence of a very complete organization of female charity. If we see more in all this than we used to see, this is quite according to God's method of teaching us. The necessities of the times have led us to discover more clearly than before some of the meanings of Scripture, and the significance of some of the Apostolic institutions. Possibly also I might say without offence that there is now a more honest treatment than heretofore of those passages of the New Testament which give gentle invitations to some, to consider whether they may not serve God best in the vocation of a single life. But I conclude this sketch of indications of a change in Biblical Interpretation, by evidence drawn from a source which to me was very unexpected. If I were to quote M. Renan in any other sense, than as one whose opinion on a point like this is made stronger by his very opposition to true Christianity, I should receive and I should deserve strong marks of disapprobation from this assembly. This notorious writer, speaking of the growth of the very earliest Christian institutions, says that the Diaconate was the first of the sacred Orders—that the care of the poor was thus, for the first time, raised to the dignity of a religious service—that presently women were associated in this employment. Thus the two sexes contributed their different qualities and combined their efforts for the solace of human misery. Thus, too, woman was at once elevated to a position of new honour, the widow especially, who had hitherto been regarded with something like contemptuous compassion. He adds that this kind of organization of woman's service, which we are apt to class among the later products of Christianity, was really the expression of its very earliest life. That which is denoted by the word "Deaconess"—viz., the marking by a sort of religious character, and regulating by a certain degree of discipline, women who are not in the bonds of marriage,—is a strictly Christian idea; and such women, he concludes, were among the best missionaries of the new religion. He says, in the course of these remarks, that the "tact" which guided the Church in its earliest days was admirable. We are in the habit of using a different and more solemn phrase for the power which guided the Apostles. So much the more serious is the argument to be derived from the facts of the case. However, all that I am bringing forward here is an additional indication of a recent progress of opinion on the Biblical side of our subject. No one is more unshackled than this author by religious prejudices: no one is a better representative of the extremest modern thought. I conceive that it is an argument of some value, if, in regard to the point before us, he is in harmony with the most sober and exact of our English commentators.

Taking all these things into view, I cannot but feel that a very remarkable change, in regard to this subject, has in a very short time come over the public mind. It seems to me very like the change of opinion which has taken place in reference to Free Trade. And, as in the case of Free Trade, practical experience has developed and deepened the conviction. Side by side with this progress of opinion there has been a progress of experiment; and experiment has again reacted on opinion, and strengthened it further. It is not merely

that success is encouraging: but by trying to do good in a certain way we discover a great amount of evil, which was unsuspected before; and thus *new* opportunities open out before us simply because we have used *some* opportunities. One result of the experiments in feminine ministration made already is this,—that certain fields for the exercise of intelligent charity are marked out more definitely than before. And we now see more distinctly than we otherwise should, that there are certain kinds of work which can be done far more efficiently by women than by men,—some which can be efficiently done by women only. Let me give one such instance, which is not very obvious at first sight. The girls engaged in the shops of various grades in our large towns—what do the Clergy know about them? What do even benevolent ladies know, who attend committees as often as domestic engagements permit? And yet there is a most pathetic interest connected with the history of many of these girls. Chosen perhaps for their good looks—separated from their homes—all their wants supplied—and with a good income to spend only on dress and on amusement:—but still with tender hearts—with recollections perhaps of early instruction—and with a longing for some strong influence to control and regulate their thoughts and conduct—I see no other means for dealing with such a class than the gentle sympathy and discreet judgment of a woman set apart for such work,—a woman whom they can always consult—to whom they can tell the tale of their sorrows and temptations—who can fortify their hesitating resolutions, and bring them into communication with the means of grace.

The whole subject appeals, at every point, to our sympathies as well as our understandings; and in passing on to what remains to be said, I would first notice, in regard to this progress of opinion and experiment, what is very instructive (for it is part of God's educating process), namely, the effect of great calamities in suggesting and maturing the organization of the charitable services of women. I need hardly mention the Crimean war, especially in connexion with one honoured name. But perhaps it is not generally known that within the walls of Sebastopol precisely the same kind of loving ministry was exercised by Russian ladies and members of the Greek Church, as outside by English ladies and members of our own Church; and that permanent results followed at St. Petersburg and Cronstadt, just as in the hospitals of London. Again, that dreadful American war, which is still so fresh in our recollection, brought into operation on a very large scale, (and I am not referring to the same American source of information as before,) devoted and efficient services of women, which are not likely to collapse when the sorrows caused by that particular calamity shall have passed away. And to come down to a moment still more recent—on the very same day this year when I happened to hear in London that war was definitely declared between Prussia and Austria, I heard that the King of Prussia had sent for a body of Deaconesses to follow the army and to be ready for the wounded. How many of these excellent women were thus engaged, I do not know; but I believe fifty went from Kaiserswerth alone: and it is a mere popular mistake to suppose that Kaiserswerth is the only centre of that wonderful organization of

varied, yet systematic, female charity. And as with war so with pestilence. What is now going on at this moment in our own country could not have taken place thirty or even twenty years ago; and in fact it did *not* take place on the occasion of previous visitations of cholera. This very morning I received a letter describing the excellent services in the North of London done by the Deaconesses from the Institution mentioned by Lord Devon; and in that letter it is especially said that they work admirably in subordination to the Parochial Clergy.

But now to refer more definitely, though briefly, to certain palpable results in the direction of official female ministrations—the first great fact that meets us is the establishment and growth of Sisterhoods in the Church of England. I do not deny that I look on much connected with these Sisterhoods with deep regret and with considerable apprehension. But for good or evil, or for both, Sisterhoods are now a great fact. It would be absolutely impossible for me to speak of them without respect and admiration; and if I were so disposed, one circumstance alone would restrain me—I mean the recent death of Dr. Neale. His contributions to our resources as to Hymns and Liturgies—his making us better acquainted than ever before with the Oriental Church—and above all his successful labours in establishing and diffusing Systematic Female Charity,—these are the marks of no commonplace career. And perhaps this slight reference to him in this Congress may come very appropriately from a speaker, who is constrained to feel that between Dr. Neale's theology and his own there is a very grave divergence. Now as to my misgivings in connexion with Sisterhoods, I cannot but feel this, in the first place, that they are not Diocesan. They do not incorporate themselves easily with the general work and system of the Church and the customary order of things. Next, they are mixed up just now, and probably will be for some time to come, with topics which cause the greatest uneasiness in the public mind, such as questions of ritual, extreme sacramental opinions, and the practices of private confession and spiritual direction. There is too an appearance of mystery about some of the Sisterhoods, which certainly excites suspicion in some minds. For this indeed they may not be altogether to blame. They may have been partly forced into isolation through want of sympathy. A movement, which might easily have been controlled in its earlier stages, may, if coldly treated, become when stronger impatient of control. Then again it may be doubted whether the kind of religious life which is fostered by these Institutions, is really the most healthy and the most in harmony with the true Christian spirit. A life, for instance, supported by vows, express or implied, is not, as it seems to me, more religious but less religious than one which is the continuous offering of a free and willing heart. And following the same line of thought which has guided me throughout,—having reference to the progress of opinion,—I am inclined to doubt whether Sisterhoods of this kind are, on the whole, better loved than they used to be; and, so far as I can see, that which is disliked in them is not that which is necessary to their work. If there is a danger of such a repugnance growing very strong in the country, even this is a reason for advocating the establishment of a

female Diaconate, which is more free and flexible, which presents fewer difficulties to the ecclesiastical authorities, which offers a greater amount of help to the Parochial Clergy. Let me say, however, that Sisterhoods of the existing kind do appear to me to present peculiar advantages in regard to Penitentiary work. And let me add another thing. As to the familiar objection to the renewal of the official work of women in the Christian Church,—namely, that the women could never be found to devote themselves in this way,—that old Drawing-room argument has now, thanks to these Sisterhoods, been swept away for ever.

Passing now to the system of Nursing, with the same view of tracing what we are gradually learning in the process of experiment, I would simply ask attention to one fact of very considerable practical importance. In endeavouring to make arrangements for establishing a system of female help for the sick on a religious foundation—we are at once met by the existence of our county hospitals and the infirmaries in our large towns. These institutions were founded by public benevolence, they are necessarily the depositories of medical skill and experience, they must be the schools for the training of our nurses, and they are supported by the contributions of all religious communions. Thus I apprehend it may be difficult to make these institutions the centres of Diocesan or strictly Church of England organizations. Conflicts may arise, and conflicts have arisen, from efforts to bring these hospitals into association with communities of nurses formed on a religious basis. I confess the progress of events leads me to think that the general improvement of the nursing of the sick in England must take place, in a great degree, on a secular basis, the more strictly religious work being separated from it. I say this with some considerable regret; because I feel deeply all the value of the opportunities for doing good to the soul, which a godly woman possesses while she is doing good to the body. Still there is a satisfactory side to this question. Nursing is in itself a very professional duty. It is quite possible that nurses may be better trained (and I could quote the highest authority for the opinion that they are better trained) under secular discipline. And if Nurses thus trained were distributed through the various districts of our large towns, there is no reason whatever why Parish Deaconesses might not be in perpetual communication with them, so as to associate their services with their own. This too is evident, that in proportion as the well-being of the sick is cared for efficiently, skilfully, and conscientiously, so far are our labours, viewed on the clerical side, limited, and our difficulties diminished. The establishment of a Parochial Diaconate of Women with distinctively religious ends in view is an easier and more hopeful task, if the female ministrations that have reference to health are already to a great extent provided.

This is the point to which all my remarks have been tending, the establishment of a Female Diaconate, which is at once Diocesan and Parochial. What I would respectfully offer to the consideration of the Bishops is this,—that well educated and godly women, after having been duly tested and trained, should be presented to their Lordships by Incumbents for appointment as Deaconesses—and that the Bishops, after having satisfied themselves by thorough examina-

tion into all the circumstances of the case, should give the appointment in some solemn and deliberate form. This procedure, would, I believe, satisfy both the precedent of the early Church, and the requirements of our own time. The question of the corporate life of Deaconesses so appointed I would regard as an open question. Whatever is included under the head of "Sisterhood" I should view simply as means to an end. Central Institutions, I think, must be felt to be of great importance, for the purpose of training, for storing up the experience of the past, and for securing succession in the future, and also for providing a home for such "Servants of the Church," as are disabled by long service or infirmities. As to the residences of those who are actually at work, I would have this point arranged according to circumstances; only I would observe that I see no peculiar advantage in solitary lodgings, while it must be remembered that many of those women, whose services would be secured under such a system, have no homes of their own. An organization of this kind would offer no hostility to any other. Sisterhoods of the conventual kind might still exist. Nurses trained on the secular plan might be distributed through many towns and many rural districts. There need be no interference. But the organization which I advocate has this advantage, that it could be made co-extensive with the Church, so far as it might be required. This only I will add, that a system sanctioned by public opinion and by ecclesiastical authority would result in securing feminine help, which is now reluctant. The best of our women will not always strike out independent courses for themselves. They prefer to work in the shade or under shelter; and such is the work which, in regard to the subject before us, we really want.

This is not the place for detail. I have thought it best to take a broad general view of the subject, instead of dwelling on particulars which are worked out best in more private and smaller meetings. And now I end with one remark of a very general kind. It appears to me that we are arrived at a period in the history of the Church of England, in which Lay-help must play a greater part than it used to play, or at least when less of the work than heretofore will be done by strictly Clerical hands. And I confess I see no great disadvantage in this. I am not disposed to take so gloomy a view as some take of the present scantiness in the supply of Clergy. Partly I should expect some good to result in time from remedial and restorative measures of which we hear, from the better organization of Theological Colleges, from the Curates' Augmentation Fund, from efforts of various kinds made at Oxford and Cambridge. God may be pleased to raise up for us a series of great religious teachers at the Universities. If this were so, we should soon see a difference in the filling up of the ranks of the Clergy. But I am inclined to look with more hopefulness to what may be called a redistribution of work. Education is now very much more widely diffused than it used to be. So is religious knowledge. And the vast activity and success of our industrial and mercantile life must, it seems to me, draw off many who under other circumstances would become Clergymen: while among those who are engaged in business there is a great amount of latent religious feeling, and more than a possibility

of obtaining willing labourers, if only the paths of labour were marked out and sanctioned. Much too of the secular work now done by Clergymen could be better done by Laymen. Some part even of the religious work can be done by the latter as efficiently as by the former. There is also a general readiness (as we have seen in the Congress this afternoon) to consider any arrangements that may be suggested with these ends in view: and the New Testament does not lay down any very exact line as to the proportion to be observed between Clerical workers and Lay workers. But now, what I am aiming at is this, that the *best* of this subsidiary help will come, not from men, but from *women*. It is presumptuous to talk of reading the signs of the times: but I cannot help believing that we have reached the period of Lay help, and especially of Woman's help. And in this may be found one answer to the present anxious cry for more Clergy. I do not think it necessary here, and now, to attempt to define precisely what is Lay work and what is Clerical work. I believe we want the service of men on the one hand, who are less exactly Clerical, and of women, on the other hand, who are more nearly Clerical. At present the male worker, even if he is a Deacon, is entirely set apart into a professional order: while the female worker, however useful she may be, is only a volunteer, without any ecclesiastical sanction at all. If we bring the former class one step lower down towards the customary life of Laymen, and bring the other class one step upwards towards the verge of the Clerical office,—then I believe we shall begin to have what the Apostolical church had—what the church of the Middle Ages spoilt—what we failed to recover in the manifold excitement of the Reformation,—what is well worthy of all our zeal, our toil, and our patience, to recover now,—the parallel Diaconate, under Episcopal sanction, of men and of women.

DISCUSSION.

THE HONBLE. ARCHDEACON HARRIS: I shall confine the few remarks which it is my privilege to make to one branch only of this most wide and interesting subject, and that branch will be what my predecessor has described as that system of "more highly organised communities which has almost a conventual character." I make this selection because, by God's providence (and I say it with deep thankfulness), I have been personally associated with this branch of the work more than with any other, and because that providential association with the work has wrought in my mind a deep conviction, which I would fain convey to those who hear me, that this system of highly organised female communities approaching to the conventual system is a work of God amongst us. In expressing that conviction, I would, with all deference to those that hear me, bring forward the grounds which have led to that conviction in my own mind, although I feel sensible that they may fail in producing a similar result on the minds of others. The first ground has been the simple manner in which these institutions and communities have sprung up within the last twenty years. The manner in which they have risen is, I think, specially indicative of their being the work of God in our midst; we cannot lay our finger upon any one individual, male or female, to whom we can attribute the whole of the movement. It is true God has raised up a Neale, a Carter, and others who fostered the work, and He has raised up women among us who have been made specially distinguished by His grace in carrying it on; but it was not by them, but by the providence of God, that the work committed to our charge has acquired the dominion it has done. Within twenty years that work has planted

its ramifications throughout England. Surely this may be looked upon as an instance of a Divine work, for the performance of which God had provided the fitting instruments. If we look further to the manner of its growth, and also at the wonderful rapidity and vitality which has been manifest, we have there another instance of something analogous to that great principle of the little mustard-seed spreading forth into a tree and bearing great shadowy branches. I trust I am not irreverent in using this simile, because I think I am using it of one little bud of that great tree. This great system seems to possess the same vitality that characterises the Church of Christ itself. There has been a growth and expansion that could not have taken place had it not been the work of God. In speaking of the system of St. John the Baptist at Clewer, with which I was personally connected, when I look back to the 18th of June, 1849, I am amazed and thankful at the results of that small beginning. The institution was started in a humble manner by a foreign lady, who had often thought of the scheme, and within a fortnight there were eighteen inmates. It then became necessary to hire another house, and a small estate was purchased. For some time a heavy debt lay upon it, and the lady who founded the institution died. At length one was raised up under whom the place has thriven. Being related to her, I may not speak much of her, but the present Superior will tell you she has been floated on in the stream of God's providence, beginning as she did with a debt, to finding herself now prosperous, with sixty Sisters and more than 150 Associates. Doors which cannot be shut have been opened for us in Devonshire, Oxfordshire, Berkshire, London, Folkestone: from all quarters cries come for help. I say again, when we behold the kind of growth and the rate of vitality, we must be led to think, "Surely this is no common work; this is not the work which we should look upon coldly or jealously, or with any feeling of envy." Let us look at the British argument of results, and view the work undertaken and done. Let us look at what I myself saw accomplished at Clewer. They have there nearly 100 inmates. Without casting a single syllable of depreciation against the many devoted persons who are carrying on similar institutions in England, this argument commends itself to our reason. If we can bring poor, fallen, abandoned creatures under the rule of Christianity in its very highest form—and surely there is no higher form than that of a highly educated, devout English woman—if we can bring these poor penitents into constant contact with such influence, we may, solely as a matter of reason, imagine we shall yet have results greater in quantity and higher in quality than is possible when the penitents come into contact with those who naturally, without any fault of their own, have not the same advantages. The results have been such that I may appeal to all who have acted with the Sisterhood Penitentiaries as to the high spiritual stamp upon those who have gone forth. To pass on to Refuges, we need only look back to the past few weeks to see how God's hand has been stretched out to smite, but at the same time to call into exercise the power of His servants. Again, how with the orphans, the hospitals, the cause of education, the nursing of our poor, the system has thriven. I need only mention the word East Grinstead. I hold in my hand a statement that these Sisters have opened in Haggerston and London houses where they now contemplate the nursing of the sick and the education of the poor, and, what is of most importance, the rescuing before their fall and keeping before their fall the poor young women of the place. In all this we may point to results which twenty years ago were not, when the Sisterhoods were not. It is not bad logic to say that these have wrought a work that would not have been accomplished without them. Again, I would point to another argument which applies, so far as it goes, to the whole great question of female ministrations. The two last census have revealed a singular state of Christian society within our own country—namely, the immense preponderance of the female sex. The last census, I believe, showed a preponderance of something like half a million. This will lead to more female employment, some will say; but I view it as a remarkably providential feature of the present day, that when there is this anomalous state of society, God has created amongst us a high vocation, a high calling, a vocation in the highest sense of the word of God calling His servants to do a particular work for Him. There is now an opening for the devout women that there was not twenty years ago. I do not speak of the claims that our families, our Sunday Schools, our nurses, our Deaconesses' Institutions, and the like, have upon us; but I repeat, it is a great gain to the Christian women of the day that there are these Sisterhoods open to them. My general conclusion, then, would be that drawn from Dr. Howson's most interesting paper—that we ought not to turn the cold shoulder upon these institutions: we ought not to look upon them jealously or disdain them; we should regard them as the work of God to be cherished and prayed for, and to be as far as possible assisted by us. I do not for one moment

deny some of the things that have been said, but would use them as a further proof of my assertion that Sisterhoods are the work of God. It may be true there are processes by which our great enemy is trying to raise his evil work alongside and on the confines of our great undertaking. It may be so. When the great movement commenced there was a degree of unreality and sentimentality about it that has now completely passed away. There were many young women who thought it a pretty thing to be a Sister of Mercy, and wear a peculiar habit and the like; but all that has gone. There is nothing sentimental now; nothing soft in the work. I would say just a word upon what, to speak in plain English, I may term the Romanising tendencies of these institutions. Grant that there is such a tendency, there is much to be said in excuse. Where were those who (I believe under God) founded these establishments to look for their models, to procure their rules, to get plans for their buildings? The plan of the premises at Clewer was brought to us by a nun from Belgium, although she ultimately turned out an imposter. I mention it to show that at the commencement we were obliged to look abroad to learn how to regulate our affairs and go properly on. In doing this, many perhaps were struck with the admirable organisation that prevailed on the Continent; they copied the system, and was it surprising they brought it out here as it were with a foreign wrapper round it, and that then perhaps things bearing a certain likeness to Rome were introduced amongst us? But I feel convinced that the more we accept this as the work of God, the more will the English spirit rise up in its favour and make it truly and heartily English—not Roman, or anything connected with it. I do not know that my feeble endeavours to convince you have succeeded, but I would once more remind you that there are sufficient indications that this is the work of God to make us careful, lest by crying it down or showing it hostility we be fighting with God. And if it be the work of God, it will have the work of Satan close by it. The way to save our Sisterhoods from being Romanised is to favour them, and take care that we foster them with our whole hearty, common sense, practical English sympathy.

HIS GRACE THE PRESIDENT, said that the hour of adjournment having now arrived he regretted that owing to the fact of two sets of subjects occupying the attention of the Section at this sitting, a long list of speakers who wished to speak on the question of Female Ministrations must go away unheard.

His Grace then pronounced the Benediction.

CONCERT ROOM. WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON.

The Hon. and Very Rev. the DEAN OF YORK in the Chair.

CATHEDRALS, THEIR PROPER WORK AND INFLUENCE.

THE CHAIRMAN: It affords me very sincere gratification to give effect to the regulation of his Grace the President, and to occupy the chair at this important sectional meeting of the Congress. The subject which we are to have under our consideration is Cathedrals—their Work and their Influence. In commending this theme to your notice, I may perhaps be permitted to say that to my mind it is a source of sincere thankfulness that the cathedrals of our land are daily gaining ground in public estimation, are doing more work, and are exercising more and more their legitimate influence. There was a time when cathedrals did no work and exercised no influence. There was a time when they were regarded with little interest, when their walls were allowed to moulder to decay, and when their services were cold, flat, meaningless, and without life. I hope that those times are for ever passed away. It

would be presumptuous on my part to pronounce any opinion, when there are those who can speak with better knowledge than I can, as regards many of those glorious edifices. I may, however, be permitted to make, in passing, one or two remarks with regard to a northern cathedral respecting which I have a little information. That cathedral is not a very small one—indeed I may say it is a large one and the glory of our land; but I am almost beginning to think that it will require enlargement. At that building I am thankful that at no period of the year do we worship within empty walls. During the summer months we have a variety of visitors, attracted no doubt by a variety of motives. Some come perhaps (and probably) from mere curiosity, some from a love of architecture, and I hope go away without regretting their visit. Others come, and I believe not a few, to attend our services, to profit by our ministrations, and, I would fain hope, to deepen their spiritual life. In the winter months, after we have had our summer holidays, after we have enjoyed our summer recreations and have returned to our homes, our firesides, and our family circles—I do not say it in any spirit of boasting, but I speak with the deepest humility—but it is a source to me of the deepest thankfulness that we have a steady, unfailing, and not inconsiderable daily congregation. It has been my privilege to be connected with York Minster for a period of not less than a quarter of a century, and during that period we have had regular weekly Communions. Last year we established with very considerable success the weekly Offertory—and I have no reason whatever to regret that we have recently established choral celebrations. These rubrical arrangements I have no reason to think are unacceptable to our congregations. We have, of course, daily prayer in the choir; and in that choir three-fourths of the seats are free and open. During the winter months we have a Sunday nave service, and I am not ashamed to say that in that magnificent nave every seat is free and unappropriated. Perhaps I am speaking rather egotistically, but I cannot help thus expressing my sympathy with what I think is a most important movement, a movement which I know to be popular with large classes of working men, and which has been the means in this ancient city of bringing vast numbers of the labouring classes to church. It is not for me to take credit to myself for what has been done; but being honoured with a great number of visitors on this occasion, and welcoming them, as I most sincerely do, to this ancient and I trust not inhospitable city, I could not refrain from dwelling thus particularly on that which concerns our own cathedral, and in which I know the citizens of York would support me. I will now call upon my excellent and kind friend who has come amongst us from a very considerable distance, the Dean of Ely.

THE DEAN OF ELY READ THE FOLLOWING PAPER:—

I HAVE a little difficulty in treating this subject, arising from the fact that it is nearly allied to that which was assigned to me by the committee of the Congress held last year. I was then required to produce a paper of which the title should be, “Cathedrals and Capitular Bodies, and how to increase their usefulness;” and it is

manifest that many thoughts suggested by this title would equally be suggested by that of the present paper. Hence if I should to any extent repeat myself, I must take shelter under the apology that I am acting in obedience to authority, while I take pleasure in the consideration that the repetition of the subject of Cathedrals as one of those to be brought prominently under the notice of this Congress, and through this Congress under the notice of the Church at large, may be regarded as a proof that the work and influence of Cathedrals are more and more occupying the attention of thoughtful Churchmen.

I do not think it would be profitable, and I am sure that in my own case it would not be graceful, to consider how far the *subjective* abuses of cathedral foundations have justified the *objective* abuse which they have received; but certainly cathedrals have been as well abused as any institution in the country, and I was much amused some years ago by receiving a pamphlet in which the author appeared to have taken pains to collect, as in a kind of main drain, or rather a cesspool, all the dirt that had been cast at cathedrals in modern times. My purpose will not be to empty this cesspool, but rather to make to a sympathising audience a few suggestions concerning the capabilities of our cathedrals, and to say something also concerning certain difficulties under which they labour.

Let me here interpose the remark, by way of parenthesis, that I assume as an axiom that the great purpose of cathedrals, as of all churches, is to preach the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to advance His kingdom. The question, however, is chiefly this, what is their department of work as distinct from that of parish churches; it is a different work, and a less direct one, but still it is one not to be despised, and we may say of different churches as of different Christians, that they have received grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ, and that to one is given one gift, to another another. Any remarks, therefore, that I may make will be made subject to the one great truth that the work of cathedrals is the work of Christ.

One difficulty, which stands very much in the way of giving to our cathedrals their proper moral and spiritual position in the diocese, arises in many instances from their local position. In some cases it would seem almost impossible that the mother church of the diocese could be more awkwardly situated with reference to her children than our existing cathedrals actually are. Of course this awkwardness arises to some extent from the unwieldy magnitude of the dioceses, and the discussion of the position of the cathedral thus runs immediately into that of the subdivision of dioceses, which has already been more than once before a Church Congress; into this discussion I do not intend to enter, but I think it right to say in passing that the influence of the cathedrals would be more powerfully felt if the dioceses were not only smaller, but were (as Mr. Beresford-Hope has often urged) bounded by the civil divisions of the counties. But, independently of the question of the magnitude of the diocese, the situation of many cathedrals is bad;—a point which I had intended to prove by reference to a map of England divided into dioceses, with the place of the cathedral marked in each. I found, however, that it was not easy to carry out this intention: I had difficulty in finding

such a map, and the only place in which I was able to discover what I wanted was at the office of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. In the board-room of that office are suspended upon the walls two magnificent maps—one representing England divided into dioceses before the days of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, the other representing it in its reformed condition; and the secretary was kind enough to show me the same thing in a reduced form in a Parliamentary volume, printed, I think, for the Commissioners, but which I could not find in the Cambridge University Library. Thus I found it impossible to obtain so apparently simple a thing as a map of England divided into dioceses, without going to make a copy of the map at the office of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. I mention this partly for the purpose of suggesting that the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge would do the Church a service by putting upon their list of publications a map such as that of which I speak.¹

However, without any map, it is very easy for me to illustrate, by a few sentences, the awkwardness of situation of which I am speaking. I will take two or three examples. Let Chester be the first. Here we have the most important town by far in the diocese—I mean, of course, Liverpool—separated from the cathedral by the wide estuary of the Mersey, and by a moral estuary of thought and feeling which is wider still. How is it possible that a town like Liverpool can receive due influence from a cathedral at Chester? I might say, how can it receive due influence from any cathedral except one of its own, which in truth it much requires and ought to have. But take a very different example, that of Peterborough. Here we have the cathedral in quite a corner of the diocese—close, in fact, to the diocese of Ely, while such towns as Leicester are far removed from its neighbourhood. A similar remark applies to my own cathedral of Ely: it is on the very verge of the diocese of Norwich, while to the county of Bedford it is comparatively inaccessible. And, once more, it may well be asked how a due influence can be exerted by the cathedral of Exeter upon the long and peculiar county of Cornwall.

This topographical difficulty ought to be taken into account in estimating the possible influence or the shortcomings of cathedrals. It is easy to draw a picture of a model diocese, in which the cathedral is an important diocesan institution and felt to be so by the Church; but it would be hard, as things now are in England, to make this picture a reality; and therefore, asking you to look charitably upon cathedrals as institutions under difficulties, and as institutions suffering not more from their own infirmities than from the medical treatment to which they have been subjected, I proceed now to make a few remarks upon some of the ways in which cathedrals, in spite of all hindrances, may exercise a beneficial influence upon the diocese or upon the country.

1. I think that we do not always estimate sufficiently the advantage which arises to the Church at large from possessing certain principal

1 Why should not the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge publish a Church map of England and Wales, analogous to the Missionary Map of the World, exhibiting such facts as are capable of graphical illustration, and containing in the margin a few of the principal statistics concerning the Church?

temples for God's worship, unfettered by parochial ties, not dependent upon one minister, not governed by two churchwardens, not hampered by questions of church-rate and so forth, in which the members of the Church of England may see and hear the worship of the Prayer-book, in its full glory and beauty. I am not saying that all the cathedrals have always done their duty in this respect; but certainly it cannot be denied that much of the improvement which our generation has witnessed in the worship of the parish churches has been rendered easy, perhaps I might say possible, by the tradition which the cathedrals preserved during careless and evil days. The custom of daily public prayer, the chanting of the service, the use of surplices for choristers, the singing of anthems, and several other things might be mentioned as examples of propriety of worship, the tradition of which has been kept up chiefly through the cathedrals; and those who think strongly on the subject of church ornaments will remember with satisfaction that in the case of "*Westerton v. Liddell*," Dr. Lushington was only prevented from following the bent of his own judgment, and ordering the removal of candlesticks from the Lord's table, by the consideration that in so doing he would have condemned the uniform practice of the cathedrals and collegiate and royal chapels.

The worship of the cathedral should be as a central sun to warm and brighten the worship of the churches throughout the diocese. A dignity may be given there to the service of the sanctuary, which in many parish churches may not be consistent with edification; a degree of ritual may be suitable there which in village churches, even if lawful, might not be expedient; and I may observe that this principle is distinctly recognised by that canon of which we have all heard so much of late, and which, while it orders a surplice for the parish church, recognises the use of a cope in the cathedral.

At the risk of appearing egotistical, I will just refer, before leaving this subject, to my own personal experience. I was not six years old when I came with my parents to this ancient city, and attended divine service in the Minster. My lot as a child was cast, ecclesiastically speaking, in a church where the service was of a kind which may perhaps be familiarly described as a "*Brady and Tate*" service, and it will be easily understood, therefore, that the choral service of the Minster was like the opening of a new world. I do not pretend that at that early age such worship as I could offer would be very intelligent, but I do think that it is a striking result of the choral service in a beautiful building, that I am able to assert that during more than forty years the childish recollection of the service in York Minster has not faded away, but has ever been mingled with the most inspiring thoughts of the public worship of God. I am bound to add that the service in which I had the privilege of joining this morning was quite calculated to strengthen the impression which I received forty years ago.

2. One of the most marked features of the cathedral service as distinguished from the parochial must ever be the music. The music of parish churches must be limited not only by the consideration of what is edifying for the parishioners, but also by that of the skill of the choir, frequently by that of expense, and, so far as musical effect

is concerned, by the nature of the building,—for music in a church which is “built to hold” such or such a number, and which (it may be hoped) does usually hold them, can never have that soft, mellow effect which it has in a building of cathedral form and size,—so at least my experience leads me to think; in a cathedral alone all the conditions seem to be satisfied which are necessary to ensure a musical service of the highest quality, and to give an impetus to Church music throughout the country. And there are several things, therefore, connected with Church music which it is well that all persons connected with cathedrals should bear in mind: I will mention two—one is, that the service of the Church of England opens as fine a field for musical genius as musical genius can desire. Persons with æsthetic tendencies sometimes appear to take it for granted that Roman Catholics have an advantage over us in this respect; but the notion has very small foundation: let it be remembered that the English service, as generally used on Sunday morning, besides the Psalms and the metrical hymns, contains at least seven grand openings for musical compositions—namely the *Te Deum*, the *Jubilate*, *Anthem*, the *Introit*, the *Nicene Creed*, the *Sanctus*, the *Gloria in Excelsis*; and then I think it will be perceived that the greatest musician that ever lived would not desire wider scope for his powers, or better opportunity of devoting his powers to God.² The other point which I wish to mention in this connexion is, that an additional argument for musical effect is to be found in the fact that music appears to be one of the few departments connected with the Church and its service in which we are wiser than our fathers: in many things we do best to keep to the old paths; in some we almost always blunder when we lose the guidance of those who have gone before us; but in music there has been a constant growth, and it is no self-conceit if the men of modern times regard their fathers as the musical children and themselves as the musical adults. There is then, if the views just expressed be right, no deficiency of material for musical power to work upon, and no deficiency of musical power; and this being so, it seems to me that a special task devolves upon cathedrals—namely, to encourage and to direct musical composition for the Church. One very simple method of encouraging musical composition is by buying the works of composers; I should say (and it is our practice at Ely), buy extensively, try the compositions, and if they be found unsuitable put them on the shelf of the musical library; some day perhaps they will be a curiosity; as Cowper says of the medals,—

“ Which, if not rare,
Nor ancient, will be so, preserved with care.”

But besides this kind of encouragement, which composers have a right to expect from cathedrals, there is quite as important a work to be done in the way of direction. I say this with the full fear of musicians before my eyes; but I think it right to say it, because I am convinced that a cordial understanding between the priest and the musician, a cordial alliance of two parties between whom there is sometimes jealousy, would lead to an advance in Church music.

2. In the *Mass* the musical compositions are usually these—*Kyrie Eleison*, *Gloria in Excelsis*, *Credo*, *Sanctus*, *Agnus Dei*.

Take an instance of the need of this alliance from the Nicene Creed. Its different portions have different theological bearings, and the music should express these as only music can express them: the words, in fact, must not be a mere vehicle for the music, but the music must be ancillary to the words: and I grieve to say that in many compositions this truth seems to have been forgotten; in fact, there are comparatively few in which the composer has so wedded his music to the words that a divorce seems impossible.

Before leaving the subject of music, let me take the opportunity of mentioning a scheme which has for some time been in my mind, for the encouragement of Church composition. I mention the scheme for the purpose of asking opinions, and I shall be very thankful if those who take a part in this evening's discussion would kindly tell me what they think of it; if it should be favourably received by this Congress, I should be much aided and encouraged in attempting to carry it out. My scheme is this. Let each cathedral in England and Wales yearly contribute a small sum, say £5, to form a prize for the best musical composition: the prize would amount to nearly £150, and might be more if the Irish cathedrals and the English collegiate churches and chapels joined. The mode of choosing the subject and of awarding the prize would be matter of detail, but you will easily understand the general nature of the scheme; and though I have not unlimited faith in this kind of competition, still I think that a prize of such value, not merely commercially but morally, might be the means of stimulating composition, and also of directing the course which composition should take.

3. Another way in which the influence of a cathedral may be made sensible in the diocese is by the gathering together of the Bishop and his clergy, or of the Bishop, clergy, and laity, in the cathedral from time to time for the purpose of taking counsel for the spiritual benefit of the diocese. In saying this I am, of course, approaching somewhat near to the subject of Diocesan Synods—a subject which nevertheless I intend to avoid, for this good reason amongst others, that it comes on for discussion in regular course to-morrow morning. But, avoiding all discussion concerning the constitution and powers of Diocesan Synods, I think I may assume that Bishops, as well as inferior clergy and laity, are all coming pretty nearly to this opinion—that united counsel and action are necessary in order to make the Church of England the efficient minister of Christ which good men desire her to be. And this being so, I wish to suggest that the cathedral is the very best place in the diocese in which the Bishop, clergy, and laity can meet together; if there be a chapter-house, that probably may be the most convenient place to which to withdraw after joining in worship in the cathedral; but if there be no chapter-house, as is unfortunately our case at Ely, I do not know why some portion of the cathedral should not be set apart, and the gathering held in the cathedral itself.

In reference to this subject, I must mention, by way of illustration, what was done this year in Ely Cathedral. Two conferences, one consisting of clergy only, the other of clergy and laity, were held, under the presidency of the Bishop. I need not trouble you with an explanation of the constitution of the bodies which thus met in

conference, as my business is to speak only of the place where they met, and as I had the opportunity of giving an explanation this morning. As I have already said, we have, unfortunately, no chapter-house, but we found no difficulty in making an admirable chamber of conference in one of the transepts of the cathedral; I believe the arrangement gave perfect satisfaction, and we all felt, both clergy and laity, that the place of meeting gave to our consultations just that quiet, solemn tone which is so necessary, and which it is not always quite easy to infuse.

4. Such gatherings in our cathedrals, whether they be Diocesan Synods, constituted according to what we know of ancient precedents, or conferences devised with more immediate reference to existing exigencies, will have an important effect in putting the cathedral in its proper place in the minds of the inhabitants of the diocese. It seems next to impossible that such brotherly consultations, conducted in the fear of God and with such discreet wisdom as we may trust will seldom be lacking, can be without important influence upon the spiritual life of the diocese. Education, missions, parochial work, all the efforts of Christian charity, will receive an impulse which will be widely felt and which will prove (as may be hoped) a vehicle of Divine blessing. And it seems to me that the publicity which is given to the consultations of the Bishop with his clergy and laity by the fact of their taking place in the mother church of the diocese is just what is necessary in order to give them influence with the Church at large: I do not mean that the public should be present, but I mean that it is well that the fact of such consultations should be publicly known, and that it should be patent to the world that the diocese has a power of joint action, and that the constituent members of the ecclesiastical body find their strength and comfort in mutual co-operation and brotherly counsel.

5. My time is rapidly coming to a close, and there are still several subjects which I had noted for introduction into this paper. I had wished to say something concerning the relation of Honorary Canons to cathedrals of the new foundation, concerning cathedrals as homes of learning, concerning cathedral schools, concerning choral festivals, and some other matters; but I shall pass these over for the sake of finding time for a few sentences on a subject which appears to me very important—namely, the Reform of Cathedral Statutes;—a subject which has a proper place in this paper, because it is impossible that cathedrals should have their due influence until they are governed by laws adapted to their wants. My special reason for introducing the subject here is that I may tell you what was done in this matter in the last session of Parliament. A bill was introduced to amend sundry laws connected with the Ecclesiastical Commission; the chief points were to pay a third Commissioner, and to bring the estates of the cathedrals into the hands of the Commissioners. The bill commenced its existence in the House of Lords, with Lord Russell as its father, and, in consequence of the numerous amendments proposed, was referred to a select committee. In this committee the third Commissioner lost his salary, and a number of new clauses were inserted relating to a variety of subjects: amongst them was one giving power to Deans and Chapters, with the sanction of their Visitors, to submit new codes of statutes to the Archbishop of the

province, which having been approved by her Majesty in Council should become the governing statutes of the respective bodies. Had this clause become law, a new era would have opened for cathedrals, and it would have been seen whether it would not be possible to construct rules for cathedrals adapted to their real wants. Unfortunately, however, the time of Parliament was, as you know, much occupied with business of a very different kind, and the result was that Lord Derby proposed towards the close of the session, to take out of the bill everything that was likely to cause difference of opinion and to pass the remainder. This suggestion was adopted, and the curious result is, that an act has been produced from which almost everything has been excluded for which the bill was originally introduced; never was the part of Hamlet more egregiously omitted; and in the omission of clauses which might cause difference of opinion, that for reforming statutes was unhappily erased. I am very sorry for it; but I think that a step has been gained, and that when legislation is again attempted, we may possibly be able to balance the pounds, shillings, and pence clauses of the bill by some clause or clauses which shall recognise the spiritual character of cathedral foundations and embody an effort to put them upon a better footing.

6. In conclusion, let me say that I think we must not be in a hurry with regard to the development of the influence of our cathedrals. The real fact is, that we have got into a *tangle* concerning them: they fell into a diseased state by worldliness, carelessness, plurality, and nepotism, and when the disease was taken in hand no better remedy could be devised than that famous one of Dr. Sangrado, *bleeding and hot water*. If we are disposed to think that at present as much is not made of them as might be, let us be thankful for their existence in any form; and let us hope that in addition to those openings for usefulness which we have already discovered, and which are more numerous than flippant critics are sometimes disposed to allow, others may be found which may tend to make the cathedrals more completely than ever the centres of diocesan life and action.

THE REV. CANON RAINE READ THE FOLLOWING PAPER:—

The subject of cathedrals has been so fully treated by many writers, and especially by the Dean of Ely, that I shall not think of dwelling to-day upon its general aspect. It will be better to fix upon some particular point in a wide field, and examine it carefully and minutely. It has been the fashion with some to speak of cathedrals as the relics of a by-past age, which are now useless and out of date, but cathedrals have the experience of twelve centuries to appeal to in their defence. There is something so noble in their design and aim, something so grand in the influence which they have exerted, that good, we think, cannot cease to flow from a spring the waters of which have never, as yet, been scant or bitter. There are changes, of course, every now and then in men and opinions, and then shallow persons and hollow institutions show their weakness by their inability to adapt themselves to what is new; but there is no want of this power in the Capitular system, if it be properly brought out and directed.

Let me remind all here present of the threefold aim of cathedrals and chapters. The funds which belong to them, putting aside that part which is necessary for the support of the officers and workers, may be said to have been intended, in the first place, for the worship of God; secondly, for the support of the sick and poor; and thirdly, for education and missionary work.

Now, with regard to the first, few persons, if any, will be disposed to question the assistance that has been rendered by cathedrals to the worship of God. In no other places have the spirit and expression of devotion been so lovingly fostered and upheld; and by their own artistic grace our cathedrals have lent beauty unto holiness. With regard to architecture, not only had the parish churches their models in our cathedrals, but they were built, I believe, in very many instances, by the cathedral architects. In music our cathedrals have rendered inestimable service to the cause of religion. They would add largely to the good that they have already done if they established schools for organists, and sent forth teachers in music among our village choirs.

In the second place, the endowments of our cathedrals were meant to relieve the sick and poor. The first hospitals and the first almshouses were attached to our cathedrals, but many centuries have passed away since they were separated. The severance, however, was not made until the cathedrals had performed much of their allotted work in this respect. They wished to teach men the lesson of Christian charity, and, when it was learned, our religious corporations gave up with joy a great portion of their work, in this direction, to the laity. The good was being done, and the more hands that were concerned in it the better. What did it matter by whom the work was wrought, if only it was done well? Not that the cathedral bodies have deserted their duties and obligations on this point when the laity took it up. They are still giving and working, yet they seem to be few, because the number of their coadjutors is happily so great.

We now come to the third point, the advancement of education and missionary work; and on this I propose to dwell, with an especial reference to the education of the clergy. Now, prior to the Reformation, the chief instruction which the clergy and candidates for orders received was in the monasteries of the country, and in the Universities as well of England as of France and Italy. When that great religious change was made, the monasteries were at an end, and the approach to the French and Italian Universities was for various reasons necessarily cut off; so that the charge of undertaking the education of the clergy rested solely with the English Universities. It seems to have been the intention of Henry VIII. and Edward VI. to have transferred this duty to the cathedrals; and Cranmer actually drew up a scheme by which a certain number of readers and professors was to be attached to these establishments. As a preparatory and subsidiary step, the old cathedral schools were put on a better footing and were re-endowed; but nothing more was done, for neither Henry VIII. nor Edward VI. lived long enough to do what was desired. The Universities, therefore, were left with a heavy burden upon them, and they were left at a disadvantage. In mediæval times the colleges were to a great extent created and supported by monasteries in the country, for the comple-

tion of the educational work which they themselves began at home. When the monasteries were suppressed, the colleges lost their revenues, if they had not been formally secured to them; in any case they missed that annual supply of students from the country on which they could previously depend. Some of them, therefore, at once collapsed, and a regular reconstruction of the network of colleges at Oxford and Cambridge took place; and it is upon these Universities, as they stand at present, that the unexpected charge of undertaking the religious training of the clergy of the Church of England has been almost entirely thrown. The duty, however, has not been an insupportable one till recently, for from the time of the Reformation until within the last thirty or forty years there was a decrease of 60 or 80 per cent. in the number of candidates for orders, and scarcely any perceptible addition to the parish churches. But now the demand for clergy is so great, and new churches are springing up in so many directions, that we are obliged to ask upon what institutions is the education of the clergy for their special work to devolve? Are the Universities, already full to repletion, able now, among the multifarious subjects to which they devote themselves, to give a proper room for this religious training which is required? And lastly, it may be asked, are they the bodies best qualified to give it?

Now, without a thought of depreciating the noble work that the Universities are doing, it may fairly be doubted whether they *are* the places for this special religious training. Up to the present time they certainly have *not* done what seems now to be required, and the question is, can they do it? The social advantages which they offer are immense, the refinement and the intellectual energy which result from them must be admitted at once; but among such a clashing and conflict of wits, amid a crowd of men and subjects as far from each other as the poles, can any adequate place be found for theology? The space that is left for it, after all, can only be a corner. The genius of our Universities is not theological; you may call it disputatious, or eclectic, if you will. There is no provision in them for that study which, above all others, demands for a while seclusion from other pursuits and thoughts. It merely takes its turn with twenty others. I do not for one moment say that this or that thing should not be taught, but that they should not be taught too long if they tend to lead the scholar from what is to be his sole walk in after life. It would be a blessing to the Church of England if every one of her ministers had an University education, and the graces of mental culture and courteous bearing which should result from it; but, surely it is desirable that in those who would take upon themselves the priestly office the study of theology should be for a while an exclusive one; and this seclusion an University, constructed like ours, cannot bestow. But even if, amid the noise and bustle of academic strife in many an arena, the theological student can close his ears to everything but his chosen pursuit, where and how can he have given to him in one of our Universities a place for that instruction in parochial ministrations which in these days holds, and ought to hold, so high a position? And if he finds that place, how can he tell in Oxford or Cambridge what kind of treatment is wanted in the alleys of London, among the miners of Cornwall and Wales, the colliers of Staffordshire and Durham, or the cotton-spinners of Lancashire?

Now, that there is some want is evident from the attempts which have been made to supply it. The Theological Colleges that have been established in various parts of the country are a proof of this, and they are a step in the right direction. It is well known, also, to many that much good work is being done for the Church of England by the present able Vicar of Doncaster, who in this point is doing his official duty as Chancellor of this cathedral church. Dr. Vaughan has continually with him a number of candidates for orders, who not only read with him, but are also shown how to labour in a parish. Lastly, it would ill become me to pass over in silence that great and good work that has been done for the education of the North in Durham, which even a compatriot may be excused for commending. Prior to the Reformation, the magnificent Benedictine monastery in that city had two schools of its own, one within its walls for the instruction of the junior members of its own body, and another, without, for the laity. It had also a college of its own in Oxford, which, although much crippled in its revenues, still survives in Trinity College. After the Reformation, all that remained at Durham was a grammar-school, in which there were eighteen King's-scholars, each of whom received his education free for five years, and £3 6s. 8d. a year besides. Some five-and-thirty years ago, the Dean and Chapter of Durham awoke to their responsibilities in the cause of education. Instead of £3. 6s. 8d. they raised each King's scholarship in their school to the annual value of £35 or £40. But they did far more than this. Of their own free-will, and before any Ecclesiastical Commission was in existence, they appropriated a sum of nearly £10,000 a year towards the maintenance of an University. Now, however that University may have failed as a school of arts, still, any one who is acquainted with the North, and especially with the counties of Durham and Northumberland, must confess that the University of Durham has been of inestimable service to the Church of England, by what it has done in training candidates for orders.

These are some of the attempts that have been made to make up for a great deficiency, but they do not come up to the requirements of the time. We want places in different parts of the country, one at least in every diocese, at which every candidate for holy orders within that diocese shall be obliged to reside for a while, not only to occupy himself with his books, but to be made acquainted with the intricacies of parochial work, and the manners and character of the persons among whom he is to labour. Obviously, the Universities cannot give what is here specified, and it was never intended that they should. Cannot our cathedrals give it in accordance with the scheme and wishes of the sagacious Crammer? The duty of fostering education lies upon our cathedrals directly, or was taken up by them when they stepped into the patrimony of others: and they have not satisfied all these claims of duty by the establishment of grammar-schools. Something farther is required from them—something higher and holier, and still more useful. Could not a school of theology form a part of each cathedral, in which the lecturers and professors should be members of the chapter? Let every person who wishes to enter into holy orders within the diocese be compelled to reside there for a time, and let that time be short or long according to his fitness.

With some, who have just left an University, a residence of a few months would probably be sufficient. During that time, in addition to the attendance at lectures, let there be parishes or districts (which any Chapter can easily provide) in which the student can be regularly trained in pastoral work; and, if he shows no aptitude in it, let him be prevented from proceeding farther. It is better that his clerical career should stop at this point than that he should go on and mar God's work through ignorance, or look back with regret out of the Lord's vineyard, which he has been forced, perhaps against his will, to enter. Arrangements might also be made by which there could be stations provided at a distance from the cathedrals, to which the students should be drafted for this pastoral work, especially if their labours, when ordained, were to begin in that neighbourhood. For such a purpose as this we miss our old collegiate churches. There is very much to be said for such a scheme as this. On the score of expense or loss of time to the students, I do not think that any objection will hold good. It may be said, of course, "You are adding to the difficulties which prevent so many from entering into orders; we have but few candidates now: with this system we shall have still fewer." My answer is, that by increasing in this way the number of good theological colleges, you will largely increase the number of candidates for orders; zeal on one side will evoke zeal on the other; and you will have men whom the Bishops can examine with pleasure, and send with confidence into their dioceses, inasmuch as they, as candidates, are already made acquainted with the work that they will have to do. It will be an evil day for the Church of England if we have ever to depend upon a careless or an unlettered clergy. I do not see that any great outlay will be required for the erection of collegiate buildings; but if it should be otherwise, would it not be possible to obtain some assistance from the Church's common purse, which derives so large a portion of its revenues from the Chapters? Surely some money would be as well spent in adding to the numbers and efficiency of the clergy as in increasing the value of the benefices in the country. At all events, the experiment might be made in a small way. Try a single diocese, and let every candidate for orders within it be obliged to subject himself to this proposed system, or something like it. I have been speaking of what seems to be a crying want, and it is a want which our cathedrals are competent to meet. They have associations of unequalled interest, touching and hallowing services, and stores of books. The spirit of holiness is in them, a spirit which would purify and uplift the students who would work within their precincts. That little band would be severed as it were for a while from old pursuits and habits, and yet the companionship of others aspiring after the same high calling would leave no one unnecessarily alone. Some such scheme as this, if properly carried out, would link our cathedrals more closely to the holy cause of Christian education and true missionary work. And in this place it would be an emprise worthy of the ancient zeal of the evangeliser of North Germany and the mother of the Church of Sweden, the stately Minster which overshadowed once the school of Alcuin.

DISCUSSION.

THE DEAN OF CHICHESTER said: I am happy in being able to state that the improvement which has of late years taken place has been considerable. I am competent to bear witness on the subject, because, though my life has been passed chiefly in the happy duties of the pastoral office, I am not only a Dean myself but I am the son of a Dean who before his appointment to a deanery was for a quarter of a century a Prebendary, or, as it is now styled, a Canon. I remember the time when wicked men sought for office in a cathedral with the sole object of enriching themselves out of the spoils of the Church. These wicked men would attend the service regularly while obliged by the statute to do so, and yet, though often living in the town, they would never appear on week-days in their stalls when they were not paid to do so, while Deans were absolutely known to attend church only on Sundays. This had, of course, a demoralising influence on the city. It was said that unless these men were paid to worship God, worship Him they would not. The inference to be deduced from such conduct is sufficiently clear. Sometimes worse than this: wicked men were seen to attend the choral services of the cathedral that they might receive their £500 or £600 a year, and yet when they returned to their parishes they would declaim against choral service as an abomination. It was not an abomination when they were paid to attend, it was an abomination when they were not paid. I am happy to think that such wicked men have almost if not entirely disappeared from among us. And yet (as at present administered) cathedral preferments very frequently do as much harm as they do good. Political appointments are still made, and stalls (regarded as sinecures) are sometimes given as a reward for political services rendered by some member of a family employed as a political partisan or agent. But even here there is an improvement. Some attention is paid to character. Sometimes stalls have been given as a reward to merit. This is much to be deprecated. This cry about rewarding merit, and encouraging men to do their duty by the prospect before them of worldly preferment, is certainly inconsistent with the principles of our holy religion. Merit! What right have we, poor sinners—what right have we to speak of merit? When we have done all—and who *has* done all that he ought to do?—what are we but unprofitable servants? Food and raiment we have a right to ask; but those who assert a right to preferments in the Church on account of services (assumed by themselves as meritorious,) and who enlist the press in their cause, why, I will only say of *them* and their *merits*, that when I have inquired into their statements I have generally found them to be fictitious, or at all events they are men who know not what spirit they are of. When a patron has a piece of preferment to bestow, his business is not to think of rewarding merit; the servant of the Lord Jesus Christ has in himself his own great reward in the consciousness of his Master's love, the patron is bound to look out for the person most fit, through his peculiar qualifications, for a peculiar place. He is not to reward one person, to the detriment probably of many; he is not to put in a worn-out old man because he at one time worked well, but he has to think only of the good of the Church and people. And this leads us on to remark on the evil done to our parishes as well as to our cathedrals by a course of patronage adopted by some well-meaning but short-sighted patrons. A stall in a cathedral is often given with the avowed purpose of providing an increase of income to some parochial clergyman. If an increase of income is needed, give it. It were better to take it away from the cathedral altogether than to do what is now done. An excellent hard-working pastor is appointed to a stall: this implies that he is to be taken away for three months in every year from his parish—perhaps three most important months, for he has not his choice—and when he comes to his cathedral he feels that this is to be his time of recreation; he does little, or if he attempts to do something, he knows that at the end of three months he may be succeeded by another pastor thus provided for, who, with opposite views, will undo what he has done, or neglect it. The cathedral is not thought of. Our cathedrals were not established thus to eke out the income of the parochial clergy, they have a definite end to serve. I am not disparaging the office of pastor. I have laboured as a pastor all my best years, and I think that the office of pastor is perhaps the highest and happiest—I may also say the holiest—in which man can be engaged. But the pastor's is not the *only* office in the Church. The pastor himself has to depend upon men more learned than himself for much which he has to communicate to his people. He is as the man breaking stones by the wayside, to macadamise the road to the wayfarer; but he requires others to bring the stones from the quarry, and others again to hew them into shape. He is to make

easy to persons less learned than himself the results of those criticisms which have been made in the schools of learning. We require a class of learned men in the Church; men of literature, men of science, men of deep theological research and thought. The demand for this class of men is greater at the present time than perhaps at any former period of the Church's history. We require men who shall remain for a longer period than now to complete their studies at the University, and for these men, when the time has come for them to settle in life, our cathedrals should make provision. Our cathedrals are intended to be the homes of learning. Men of this sort are very often shy, reserved men, unfitted for pastoral duty; and who if they remain at the University till they are forty or five-and-forty, perhaps then take a living, and are compelled to quit the work for which they are qualified, to attempt that which they will never be able properly to perform. For a special training is required for those who would discharge well the delicate duties of the pastoral office. It is, I repeat, precisely for this class of the clergy, for those qualified to edify the Church though not skilled to act as pastors, that cathedrals have been provided by the wisdom of the Church—her provision being too often frustrated by the unwisdom of those who have the administration of her affairs. And it is because the fault lies, not in the institution, but in the administration of it, that the remedy is easy. We have only to order that the living of any one who accepts cathedral preferments shall be *ipso facto* void, and that the cathedral preferment shall be void if a dignitary accepts any parochial preferment, and what we desire will be at once accomplished. The income of the stalls may, in many instances, be inadequate for the support of a dignitary; and we cannot in these days expect any portion of the property taken from the cathedrals will be restored to them. This branch of our ecclesiastical system had become (out of proportion) wealthy, and the property was not well managed. The measure was, in my opinion, a wise one which devoted a large portion of that property to the formation and endowment of new parishes. Whether too much may not have been taken away is another question. In the more learned branch of the profession, however, we require provision for, comparatively speaking, only a few. The parishes are numerous, but those who will labour in the schools of learning (as distinguished from that really idle class, mere men of literature, amateur archaeologists, architects, theological dilettanti, and musicians) will never form a numerous class: our requirements, therefore, might perhaps be met by our diminishing the number of our stalls. Into details, however, it is impossible to enter. A Canon bound to continual residence (as a pastor in a parish,) while his first duty will be to refute the sceptic and to convince the infidel, or to produce works of philosophical or historical interest, will, if a man of vigour, be ready at the same time, to assist the Diocesan in works of piety and charity; for in a change of labour, rather than in idleness, an energetic mind finds its recreation. It is thus that, while his first concern is in his parish, a pastor keeps up his scholarship; and it is thus that, while his primary duty is in his study, a Canon may in various ways render assistance to the chief pastor of a diocese. When we come to the appointment of Deans the requirements differ. Here the object is to find a man qualified to govern. And you should look out for him among those who have been accustomed to the management of a parish, or of a college in the Universities, or of a great school. A man who has had experience in parochial affairs is likely to manage well the affairs of a Chapter. And the Church would receive an incidental benefit from the election of pastors to the decanal stalls. When a pastor has laboured for twenty or thirty years in a parish, he finds himself surrounded by a new generation; and he feels that a younger man, with sympathies in accordance with the new state of things, would do the work better than himself. He will often feel that his ways are old-fashioned, and that he cannot himself make alterations which may be expedient. An old pastor to whom I was curate forty years ago, whenever I, as the young man, suggested to him some course of proceeding to which he had not been accustomed, was wont to say to me, good-naturedly, "Wait till I am gone; you can't teach an old dog new tricks." But place such a one in a new position, and his energies will revive; and he will be suited to a work which requires regularity rather than innovation. I should regard a Chapter of learned men, presided over by one who knows how to bring the discordant elements of human society to act in harmony, who to the affectionateness of disposition which parochial work encourages, unites a firmness of principle which parochial work requires, as a blessing to a whole diocese. Really learned men, acting in concert, would keep in check the sciolists who, without reading, without knowing the history of the Church or the merits of our Reformation, with minds inflamed and misinformed by journals, presume to dogmatise upon the subjects of which they are profoundly ignorant. A

Chapter, formed as I have described it, would avoid the ridiculous mistakes into which men have fallen of late years, when, as a very learned layman observed to me, the prevalent controversies have too frequently arisen from the ignorance of those who ought to have known better. Cathedral services again, cannot be altered at the will of one; Chapters are inclined to defer to precedent, and to act on the good old Catholic principle, *τι αρχαία εβη κρατειτο*. [You are, I presume, most of you aware that there are two classes of cathedrals in the Church of England—those of the Old foundation and those of the New. The cathedrals were properly the homes of the secular clergy, but some Metropolitans, the Archbishops Dunstan and Lafranc laboured with success in several cathedrals to oust the seculars, and to introduce regulars with the Benedictine discipline. With the exception of a few cathedrals in Spain, I believe that this system was never adopted on the Continent. In Henry VIII.'s time these regulars were in their turn ousted from the eight or nine cathedrals in which they had obtained a footing, and to these a new constitution was granted, consisting generally of a Dean and ten or twelve Prebendaries. The old secular cathedrals, however, remained as they were. They had power from an early period to legislate, and they have continued to enact laws, through statutes drawn up in Chapter and endorsed by their Visitor, to the present time. In the cathedral over which I have the honour to preside, when the Ecclesiastical Commissioners visited it, they had no alterations to suggest. Our statutes were given to us in the reign of King Henry II., and we have always kept up with the requirements of the age. I mention this because, if the cathedrals of the new foundation require reform, I hope that they will not adopt fancy reforms, but that they will revert to those old principles which have been observed from time immemorial in cathedrals of the Old foundation. I saw lately a statement that in a New foundation cathedral complaints had been made of the distinction between Canons Major and Canons Minor, a peculiarity with some of the Old foundation cathedrals; and it was said that among persons who had received the same education, and who moved in the same rank of society, the subordination of some to others was offensive. It is very strange if so it is. A subaltern in the army is at mess on terms of equality with his colonel; in general society he may (being a nobleman) possibly take precedence of his colonel. It is no degradation when, on parade, that man receives the commands of his military superior, or gives him the salutes. And why should it be different in ecclesiastical affairs? But if there be an absurd jealousy of this sort (the existence of which I can hardly imagine,) do not invent new titles and new offices, such as that of Musical Canons, which has in itself an unpleasant sound, but go to the Old foundations. Our statutes describe those who are Minor Canons in the New foundation cathedrals as Priest-Vicars or Vicars-Choral, or simply Vicars. They have, indeed, since the establishment of the Ecclesiastical Commission, very quietly accepted the title of Minor Canon, and the object then was to attempt what, in my opinion, is undesirable—to bring all cathedrals to one common type; but it is easy to revert to the original title. Let our object be to secure a wise head for every cathedral—a man who, like the Dean of York will devote every energy of his mind to rule his household well; let our object be to procure a body of Canons who, pursuing their studies for the edification of the Church, will attend the services of the cathedral regularly for the edification of their own souls; let our object be to obtain a body of Minor Canons, scientific musicians, and at the same time well-informed divines; and there will be no difficulty in infusing a right tone into the lay members of the establishment; while the parochial clergy may be invited from time to time to address a multitude of worshippers in special services, saying to individual souls, "Turn ye, turn ye; why will ye die?" the edifice, the services, everything connected with the cathedral will assume a voice and say, "Whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God."]

THE REV. PRECENTOR WALCOTT, F.S.A.: I rise at the very greatest disadvantage after the admirable remarks of the three eminent gentlemen who have preceded me, and especially after those of the very rev. Dean who has just sat down, and whose name is so well known and respected in Yorkshire. I am not sure at all whether it is desirable for me to proceed, but I wish to make a few observations as to the uses of our cathedrals. I do not regard them as schools of art, of music, of architecture, or even of theology. The great object of a cathedral is the more solemn, the more efficient, the more punctual worship of God. It is the more precise carrying out of the rules of the church, especially in the observance of holidays—including that most sacred and neglected feast, Ascension Day. Pre-eminently and above all, I believe, it is the more frequent celebration of the Holy Eucharist. I say that the rule and not the exception ought to be weekly. It should be a choral celebration as it is in this city,

When I see how unfrequently celebrated it is at other cathedrals, I only wish they would all adopt York use. As to the influence and work of our cathedral bodies, I think that they ought once more to form standing councils to the Bishop, and I believe that if this restoration were effected, and if the Chapter were supplemented from time to time by what are called its non-residentiary members, the greatest benefits would result. We want the great Chapter gathered together in all its completeness, to strengthen the hands of the diocesan; and if that were done the honour and influence of our cathedrals would be greatly augmented. I agree most cordially with the very rev. Dean, that no residentiary should be allowed to hold any parochial cure, and that a stall should not be regarded as a mere supplementary source of income. A stall is in many cases a very decent competence, and a residentiary should be required to devote his whole time to it. His permanent duty ought to be attendance on the choral service of his cathedral. The Canons ought to be in residence simultaneously; and they might find sufficient occupation in the study of ritual, (in which they are often very deficient) in the study of music, in the school, in the quire, and in charitable institutions, which to the scandal of the Church of England, are most neglected in cathedral cities. I believe that in these things every residentiary might find employment suited to his high dignity, and congenial to his individual temperament; and it is work essential to the well-being of the Church; for a cathedral should be a home of devotion. The residentiaries, as I have said, should be the standing council of the Bishop; and the non-residentiaries should unite them as with golden chains with their brethren throughout the whole diocesan. I believe that our cathedrals have before them a noble future. They have won the interest of the people of England; and we see everywhere around us tokens of revival. We have daily services, choral services, special services. We have greater devotion and earnestness; but I think that we should shew by our conduct that every one of us from the youngest boy to the Dean himself, feels that he is taking part in the highest service that can engage the intellect of man. We ought to do all in our power, likewise, to induce the laity to take its share in this most august duty, and to supplement with their splendid munificence the exertions of the capitular bodies. Cathedrals, we are told are on their trial. So they are, but I say, "*Fausto omine.*" They will win the day. I believe most heartily that they are so doing; but I believe that their perpetuity depends upon one condition, namely, that they shall not stand still while the whole world is teeming with busy life around them.

Mr. BERESFORD HOPE, M.P.: Very nearly had I repented my temerity, very nearly had I snatched up my hat and rushed out in despair, at having sent up my name for a debate, which has been so thoroughly exhausted by that most admirable series of papers and speeches which we have heard, for I feared that there was not one point that I could have taken which had not been elucidated by the learning, weight, and fervent zeal of those who have gone before me. I felt, however, that having once taken the plunge it would be cowardly not to follow it up; and, I beg leave to call your attention to what I desire should be a sort of practical summing up and realization of what you have heard. In the morning this room was filled by an attentive audience on the question of Diocesan Organization. Cathedrals have occupied us now; and in a very few hours another meeting, not indeed a formal branch of this Congress, but very closely indeed allied with it, will be held in this city, to consider the sub-division of our dioceses. It is quite clear that all these questions hang together. A diocesan without a cathedral is like a body trying to walk after its head has been cut off; and I think that to entrust a diocese to a bishop without a cathedral, is like setting the head on the table and expecting it to speak, while the body is not forthcoming. I take then these three topics, as three branches of the solution of one great problem—how shall we reorganize the Church of England, so as to meet the wants of the English people? And I ask what practical lesson can be derived from the papers and speeches which we have heard? You say that a cathedral is a very useful thing. You say that the multiplication of cathedrals is very much needed. Why, then, cannot England build or organize somewhere a new cathedral? Perhaps, you may rejoin, "can anything be more Quixotic?" but remembering the churches we have restored all over the land, such new churches as that of Colonel Akroyd, and the colleges of Mr. Woodard, we must admit that compared with these great ventures, as they would have appeared to us looking forward to them from the darkness of 1830, a new cathedral does not appear so very unattainable, prospectively viewed to it from the comparative light of 1866. Take one of your great towns—take Liverpool, take Bradford, take Huddersfield, and organize there your cathedral. I put down for the building £80,000 or £100,000—£180,000 would of course, be

better; but for about £80,000 you might have a very good cathedral—as far as the mere building went. But, suppose it took £150,000, including both building and endowment, what is £150,000 to cotton and sugar-stuffed Liverpool? What is it I say, when for that sum you organize your cathedral; and you build your great church, where you are to have your grand services, your school of music, your school of religious art, and your frequent choral communions; and where the Church of England can come home to all its people's hearts. I would say, "*Fas est*," not *ab hoste*, but "*ab alienigenis doceri*." The Irish have built their cathedrals or their large churches in Salford, and Preston, and Nottingham, and Birmingham, and why should we not build cathedrals at Manchester and elsewhere? If a church so much poorer has done it, why should we not do it with all our wealth and our great connections? Speaking *a priori*, should we not say, that if ever there was a country where the Cathedral movement could not spring up it would be Anglican Ireland; and yet in Ireland there is rising up in her third city of the country, a cathedral which in point of grandeur will stand first amongst the buildings which have been produced in the British Isles, since the revival of Gothic art. I mean the cathedral of that Dean whose speeches we have listened to with so much pleasure,—Cork. Again, in the poor country town of Tuam, the zeal of the Provost behind me is raising a church worthy of the services of a cathedral. Need I tell you what Mr. Guinness has done at St. Patrick's, Dublin. You know how the movement is progressing in the colonies. You have all heard of the grand Cathedral of Montreal, and of the not very correct, but still the grandiose and well intentioned Cathedral of Calcutta. The Bishop of Newfoundland talked to us last night of the poverty and zeal of his people; but out of that poverty they are building what, when completed, will be a very noble Cathedral Church. The question is, will you go away from this Congress and say, "The Deans of York, Ely, and Chichester have told us what useful institutions cathedrals are, and while Chichester with its 8,000 inhabitants, York with its 50,000, and Ely with its 2,000, have each its cathedral; Liverpool with its 500,000, Birmingham with its 300,000, and Bradford with its 150,000, have none." Thus we fancy there is nothing to be done. Leeds is very near Ripon, but still it should have a cathedral of its own. If you cannot build them, why should you not at least organize cathedrals? Cathedrals are institutions as much as buildings. The work of the Chapter, incessant teaching and incessant worship in all its choral dignity and beauty, might go on while the walls of the church were still rising.

The Rev. A. SHADWELL: I remember a remarkable expression which the Lord Bishop of New Zealand uttered in his first charge—"I trust never to hear 'the dignitaries of the Church' mentioned in this diocese of mine." We must bear in mind that it was a man of a most holy, primitive, and apostolic mind that uttered this sentiment; but I suppose he was accustomed at home to the idea that the enjoyment of *otium cum dignitate* was the only object of caputular bodies. I presume, also, that when the Ecclesiastical Commissioners introduced their reform they also thought that the only purpose for which caputular bodies were attached to cathedrals was that they might revel in this "*otium cum dig.*," as it was called by an abbreviation which showed that to the popular apprehension there was more of ease than of dignity about it. If the founders of our cathedrals could be told the state to which they have been reduced within our memory, they would scarcely recognise their magnificent endowments. The spectacle of the Dean marching into his quire, attended only by a single Canon, is highly unedifying to the people, and has given them a right to question the usefulness of cathedral bodies. When the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, upon whose report the Act of Parliament was framed, which settled the present condition of our cathedral bodies, adopted their measures, they suppressed in some cases even the precentor. They did this because they found that the office for which the salary was taken, had fallen into desuetude, and that there was therefore no necessity to continue one officer, next in dignity to the Dean himself, to direct the services of the Church. That was, no doubt, their idea, and perhaps it was justified by the existing state of things. We live in days when sinecures are abolished, and when the question is put, "What do these men do for their pay?" It is upon the answer to that question that the continuance of the caputular bodies depends. We have a right to demand of those who enjoy these endowments that the worship of God shall be performed in its integrity, and that they shall endeavour fairly to present to the public the theory which they represent. We have almost alienated the people; the traditions of piety and truth have very much declined; and the question is, How can we elevate the popular faith except by reviving the system of the Church in its integrity? But if the services of our cathedrals are performed in a perfunctory manner, we shall

not show that we heartily believe in the system we represent. It seems to me that our cathedrals should throw themselves into the missionary work of the diocese. When I was in the Tyrol I saw what had been done to perpetuate the effects of the movement that had taken place in 1865. The Tyrolese are a highly religious people, and by the wayside I saw a huge cross, upon which were inscribed these words—"Only no more deadly sin!" That inscription greatly struck me. It showed that there must have been a great awakening and stirring up, to have left this memorial behind it. That was a specimen of the kind of work which might be carried on under the superintendence of our cathedral bodies, and would be strictly statutable.

The Rev. C. H. SEYMOUR, Provost of Tuam: I have come forward at your request to remove an erroneous impression which seems to prevail about the Church of Ireland. There is a growing church feeling in my country. More churches have been erected in it than in any other part of the kingdom considering our relative positions; seven cathedrals have been built, and two are building, and one is in progress of restoration. In England it is very easy to raise large sums of money for building a church, but in Ireland it is very difficult to do so; but I believe that if the Churchmen of this country will only stand by the Irish Church, that church will rise with healing in her wings. With respect to the Cathedral of Tuam, the Roman Catholic population take the greatest possible interest in it. When the Lord Bishop of Tuam laid the memorial stone of that church 200 Roman Catholics stood by me, and they said they would be amongst the first to wish prosperity to the work it represented. The great fault of the Church of Ireland no doubt is that she is not sufficiently alive to ecclesiastical principles and to church order, while true to the glorious doctrines of the Reformation; but that is a reason why our fellow Churchmen in England, instead of throwing us overboard, should stand by her and show her that those principles are necessary to the complete carrying out of the Reformation. I trust, therefore, that you will continue to look with favour upon us till our Church, as I believe she yet will, gives Ireland a right to be called

"Great, glorious, and free;
First flower of earth, and first gem of the sea!"

The Very Rev. Chairman then pronounced the benediction.

WEDNESDAY EVENING.

THE CONVERSAZIONE,

AT THE

FINE ART AND INDUSTRIAL EXHIBITION.

CONGRESS HALL. THURSDAY MORNING.

His Grace the PRESIDENT in the Chair.

IMPROVEMENT OF THE PROCESS IN ECCLESIASTICAL COURTS.

The CHAIRMAN:—Before we commence the proceedings I am sure I need not bespeak for all those who may address you a respectful attention, and a due observance of order. We have hitherto been very successful in this respect, and I trust to the good feeling of the meeting that it will be so conducted to the end.

SIR R. PHILLIMORE (THE QUEEN'S ADVOCATE) THEN READ THE FOLLOWING PAPER :—

THE theme is unattractive, and one which I should not perhaps myself have chosen for discussion, before the present audience and upon the present occasion. It has been placed among the number of subjects to which the attention of Churchmen should be drawn at this meeting, principally, I believe, on the following grounds :—Recent judgments of the highest Court of Appeal in Ecclesiastical matters, having created great and general dissatisfaction as tending to show the feebleness of existing Ecclesiastical discipline with respect to unsound and heretical teaching, naturally led to many inquiries as to the mode by which the remedy for so serious an evil could be obtained. While some persons were of opinion that justice, the reason of the thing, and the practice of the Church, combined to demand a radical alteration in the constitution of the tribunal which gave these judgments ; it occurred to others, and I believe to his Grace the President of this Congress, that a part, greater or less, of the evil might be ascribed to the system of administering justice, and especially to the form of pleading, adopted in the Ecclesiastical Courts, from which the appeal lay to the Privy Council.

I am bound to state that, after much reflexion and consideration of the subject, I am unable to arrive at the conclusion that the grievance of which the Church complains can be effectually remedied by a reform in this quarter. First, because the wound will, I fear, be found to lie much deeper, and incapable of being healed by an operation which does not probe its depth, but attempts to smooth its surface. Secondly, because I think it will be found, upon examination, that the reformation, which was at one time certainly much needed in the practice of these tribunals, has already been effected by the joint operation of recent statutory law and of rules promulgated during the last year by the present distinguished Judge of the highest Ecclesiastical Court in the Southern Province. It is, however, certainly right that every system of law, Ecclesiastical as well as civil, should at different epochs be revised and interrogated, so to speak, as to whether it does its duty, in the existing state of things to which it is applied. The innovations of time must be met and corrected in every well-ordered system by the innovations of man. The continual change in manners, habits, and customs, the perpetual alteration in some of the materials upon which the edifice of the law is built, render necessary corresponding repairs and readjustments of the whole structure. The weights are frequently shifted, and the balance must be frequently redressed. We all know, moreover, with what reluctance those who have grown old in the administration of a particular system consent to make the changes which have become requisite, and with what difficulty they are induced to open their eyes to the necessity of a reform, which is obvious to all competent persons unconnected with the immediate administration of the system.

Nevertheless it does sometimes happen that a system, as well as a man, continues to bear the blame of faults or habits which it has

in truth discarded and abandoned. Various causes conduce to this, among them ignorance of the *fact* that the change has taken place, but not unfrequently also a determination not to be aware that such is the case. Reformation of a system is naturally odious to those who wish to destroy it. They think themselves injured if they may not hang the animal to which they have been enabled to give a bad name. They insist, with an invincible incredulity, that no improvement has been effected, and pertinaciously continue to urge as an argument for its destruction the existence of abuses or defects which have been removed. And so it has fared, in some degree, with the mode of procedure in the Ecclesiastical Courts. I will endeavour to state shortly what that system once was and what it now is.

The administration of justice in every tribunal (apart from the consideration of the judges who are to give their verdict upon the facts and to interpret and apply the law to them) may be said to depend upon the *mode of pleading* and upon the *rules of evidence*. It should be the object of all pleading to enable the parties to a suit so to state the positions of law or fact, upon which they respectively rely, as to bring the points in controversy between them to a clear and intelligible issue. But the mode of obtaining this end has been and still is very various in different countries, and especially with reference to the fact whether the jurisprudence administered was founded upon the feudal or the Roman law. In England the common law has long been and still is, both as to its mode of pleading and in the investigation of facts, of a character peculiar to this country. So far as the pleading is concerned, it is limited to the object of apprising the court, and the other party to the suit, of the point of law or the fact which it is intended to establish, but which, as a general rule, gives no intimation of the intermediate facts, so to speak, which it will be necessary to prove, or of the kind of evidence by which they will be substantiated. The procedure of the Ecclesiastical Courts and of the courts of equity was originally derived from a totally different system of jurisprudence—namely, from the civil law of ancient, and the canon law of modern, Rome. In the Ecclesiastical Courts the pleading which stated the case on behalf of the plaintiff in the *civil* suit was termed a “libel,” and in the equity courts a “bill.” It was always a characteristic of this libel (as it is now of the bill which, not long ago, adopted this improvement) that it was divided into a number of heads, positions, or articles, each of which contained a portion of the history, that is of the leading facts and epochs of the case which it was intended to maintain, and to which therefore the attention of the defendant was especially invited. So much for the *civil* suit; in which form, before the testamentary and matrimonial jurisdiction was taken away from these courts, the greatest amount of the business was transacted.

In the *criminal suit* the pleading assumed the denomination of *articles*, by which, according to the technical expression, “*the office of the Judge*” (that is, of the Bishop) was, after he had given his consent, “*promoted*.” Some suits in substance civil, from reasons which there is no time to discuss, are instituted in a criminal form; but by far the most important subjects of these suits are criminal proceedings instituted against clerks in holy orders charged with offences against morality or religion.

These criminal articles, like the civil libel, are divided into separate positions, containing in the case of offences against morality statements of the principal facts connected with the main charge which it is intended to prove; and in cases of doctrinal offences citations of the language employed, orally or in writing, which are alleged to contain the heretical doctrine. Besides these articles there were certain others of a technical and formal character which, though perhaps more defensible than the counts of an indictment at common law, were still open to the objection of being practically unnecessary, and of leading to increased delay and expense. I have, therefore, great satisfaction in stating that, quite recently, the learned Judge of the Court of Arches has issued a set of new rules and regulations, which, among other reforms, have simplified the pleadings by the rejection of these formal articles.

The practice which prevails with respect to the right of the defendant to oppose the admissibility of each separate article is perhaps liable to some objection, though it errs, after the English fashion, upon the side of indulgence to the accused party.

For instance, if the charge against the clerk be that of teaching heretical doctrine, various passages in the sermon, speech, or essay in which it is alleged that the heresy is contained must be set forth; and if there be various heresies, the passages must be set forth in different articles of the charge, as indeed, for the sake of convenience, they must sometimes be when only one heresy is the subject of the charge. These citations from the work of the accused clerk ought, of course, to be sufficiently full and extensive to substantiate the charge; but to make such citations is never an easy task. It often happens that the heresy is not stated in explicit terms, but lurks in an argument extending over several pages. The conclusion may be a long way off from the premises. The whole argument (the accused person is in the habit of contending) ought to be stated. Garbled extracts ought not to be made, passages ought not to be torn from their context. Another part of the essay ought also to be set forth, because it qualifies or modifies the assertions, or balances positions, which are the subject of the accusation. These arguments, and others of a like kind, are familiar to all counsel who have conducted the attack or defence in these criminal suits. While this contention on the part of the accused is in the main founded in justice, it necessarily leads to much practical difficulty, and to great length in the extracts from the work of the accused in order to avoid this mode of defence. It is also the practice of the court to require that the law which it is alleged that the passages contravene shall be stated. The law is derived from various sources, and requires careful selection and statement.

Then it is the right of the accused to object (or demur, as the common lawyers would say) to each separate article, as not *per se* containing an heretical doctrine, or as not contravening the law cited. There is practically vested in the Judge a considerable discretion as to this matter. The effect of striking out an article of charge is to relieve the accused from the necessity of answering it, and to compel the accuser to sustain the charge of heresy out of the charges which are left.

It may happen that the accuser or promoter of the office (to speak

technically) does not appeal from but acquiesces in the rejection of the articles, meaning to rely on the remaining articles as sufficient to obtain a sentence sufficiently severe against the accused, and that he does obtain such a sentence, but that then the accused appeals to the highest court, and, claiming on the one hand that the articles whose rejection has been acquiesced in shall be no longer referred to, claims on the other hand that the remaining articles are, *per se*, and without reference to the rejected ones, insufficient to sustain the sentence which has been passed upon him.

And for this position there is of course much to be said : but as for the position, sometimes advanced, that in order to illustrate the meaning of the passages objected to in the articles which do remain, the promoter is not at liberty to refer to other passages in the same sermon, speech, or essay—this is a position which can only be maintained by a determination to stifle, at any cost of justice, the whole discussion. Justice, reason, and all legal analogy require that the passages objected to should, whether for attack or defence, be illustrated by the whole context of the work from which they are taken. And for this purpose, therefore, the whole sermon or essay should be appended to the articles of charge. I think that will be pronounced to be the true issue on this subject, should unhappily any occasion arise for putting this opinion to the test.

And here I must confess my earnest aspiration that no such occasion may arise. Sure I am that questions affecting the doctrine or the sacraments of the Church, even when counsel strive to treat them with that reverence, which counsel who respect themselves always will treat them with, are never discussed in a court of law without inflicting pain upon the believing mind, and giving scandal to the Church of Christ. At the same time, nobody, I may perhaps venture to say, knows better than myself the extreme difficulty there is in always so guarding one's words as not occasionally to let fall an expression that might better have been avoided ; and nothing can be more unfair than to fasten upon a phrase which may have been called forth from counsel by the excitement of the moment, and found upon it a permanent charge against him.

I have spoken of the *modes of pleading* in civil and criminal suits ; let me now say a word upon the subject of *evidence*. The great source of delay and expense in the Ecclesiastical Courts was the habit, borrowed originally, but corrupted by the borrower, from the civil and canon law, of taking down the evidence in a cause on paper : the examination and cross-examination, through written interrogatories, of the witnesses, being conducted by an examiner who supplied the place of the Judge, and in the absence both of the parties to the suit and their counsel. The evidence thus taken was read over to the witnesses, who afterwards signed their depositions, which were then, according to the technical phrase, *published*, and the cause heard upon them. A heavy expense was then incurred by the necessity of furnishing several written copies of evidence, which not unfrequently occupied the space of a small folio volume, and sometimes extended to a much greater length.

This procedure has been severely censured, and was undoubtedly open to very grave objections. It had an advantage in securing

the permanence of the testimony in the event of the death of the witnesses, or of an appeal; and the result of my experience is that the truth from a thoroughly honest, but also thoroughly nervous, witness is best obtained in this manner; but it is also my firm conviction that, speaking generally, the interests of a suitor in a civil suit suffered greatly in various ways from the secret examination, and that in the criminal suit justice was often altogether defeated by it. Acting on this conviction, in the year 1854, I introduced a bill into Parliament for the admission of *viva voce* evidence into the Ecclesiastical Courts. I was obliged to omit the Irish courts from my bill, the practitioners at that time, through Mr. Whiteside, opposing the measure without compensation to those whose interests were affected by it; but by the exertion of some diligence I succeeded in carrying my bill for the English Ecclesiastical Courts through the House of Commons; by the powerful aid of Lord Brougham it passed the House of Lords, and became law under the title of 17 and 18 Vic., cap. 47. The effect of it has fully answered my expectations, several important cases, civil and criminal, have been tried under it, and the advantages of the oral over the written evidence have been clearly shown. These advantages are, a great saving of expense, a greater saving of delay, and a far more satisfactory eliciting of the truth.

The old rules and orders which governed the *service*, as it is called, of citations, and other instruments connected with particular days for the sittings of court, also have been fruitful in delay. This evil has been removed in the Court of Arches by the recent rules to which I have referred; and towards the end of last term, a suit relating to alterations improperly made in a church, and in which an affirmative issue had been given, was heard in, I believe, less than a month from the time of its institution. And cases of disputed church-rate may now be heard at least as speedily as before any bench of magistrates, who could, of course, not try the question whether the objects for which the rate was raised were lawful and proper, which it would be the province of the Ecclesiastical Court to determine.

But after all, the administration of justice must mainly depend upon the proper constitution of the tribunal, and the appointment of a proper judge. To maintain the discipline of clerks in holy orders is a duty, to the performance of which every Bishop is bound by his office, and which he solemnly pledges himself to execute at his consecration. He ought never to divest himself of it, but he ought to exercise it always, and especially in cases where the cure of souls is connected with the question of a freehold, with proper legal advice, and the assessorship of learned divines. Under the provision of 3 and 4 Vic., cap. 56, the Bishop has full power to avail himself of this assistance; and God forbid that it should ever be truly predicated of the Church of England, as I fear it may now be truly predicated of the Church of France, that there are many hundreds of clerks in holy orders deprived, unheard and untried, of their functions and their livelihoods by the secret, arbitrary, uncontrolled, unappealable, interdict of their Bishops! The old law provides the Archbishop of each province with the means of appointing a proper judge or assessor of the appellate court. These appellate Archiepiscopal courts might, I think, be further strengthened and improved. But now arises a

question of the very gravest importance—namely, *whether the Ecclesiastical jurisdiction, properly so called, ought not here to end?* The subject, layman or ecclesiastic, whose freehold is taken away may retain the right of going to his sovereign for redress in the last resort. But should not this appeal be confined to what canonists have designated the “*appellatio tanquam ab abusu*,”—to which, as to the whole subject of the court of ultimate appeal, I referred in a paper read at the last Congress? At all events, in whatever form the Crown is petitioned, whatever jurisdiction it exercises, whether of a court of appeal upon the merits, or of prohibition on the ground of excess of jurisdiction to the Ecclesiastical authority, should not the Church endeavour to set herself free from all necessity of intermeddling, in any way, with this secular court, further than by assisting when duly required to inform its conscience upon a matter of disputed doctrine?

I venture very humbly but very earnestly to commend this question to the consideration of your Grace and of this Congress.

DISCUSSION.

A. J. STEPHENS, Esq., Q.C., LL.D.: The reform of the Ecclesiastical Courts has been contemplated from the time of the Reformation, but down to the present moment they remain substantially as they were in the reign of Edward VI.; and the Ecclesiastical Law is the only branch of our law that has not been adapted to meet the just and imperative requirements of the age. It appears to me that there are two practical questions to be considered. The first is, Whether the Ecclesiastical Courts and their procedure require amendment? and the second, assuming that amendment is required, what is the best course to be pursued in effecting it? As to the first question, it is essential to ascertain what are the precise facts of the case; and I think that the report of the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury, as well as the statements of Lord Cranworth when he was Lord Chancellor, and of the eminent prelate who now fills the chair, can leave but one impression upon our minds—namely, that the present procedure and practice of our Ecclesiastical Courts is a scandal upon the administration of justice. In 1853 the Upper House of Convocation state in their report—

“That they are unanimously of opinion that the present state of the law touching the discipline of the clergy is unsatisfactory, and that it needs amendment. That the great expenses and delays attending such proceedings, which amount frequently to a denial of justice, have not been removed by the recent acts upon this subject. That the provisions of the last act, which governs the present administration of the law, are inadequate for the purpose. That the preliminary inquiry under that act savours too much of an actual trial, without its safeguards or conclusion, while it has been doubted whether those provisions which were intended to govern the actual trial, could safely be used for its conduct. . . . That it is highly important that such evils should be remedied.”

The system was, in the House of Lords in 1856, (141 Hansard, 3rd series, p. 1255,) characterised by Lord Cranworth, then Lord Chancellor, as cumbrous, dilatory, and expensive. He quoted the case of *Farnell v. Craig*, as an illustration—

“The proceedings commenced in March, 1845. The Commissioners, who sat for nine days, no doubt at an enormous expense, agreed upon a report. Mr. Craig was not satisfied with it, and brought the case into the Court of Arches in November, 1845, where it remained hung up and pending, at an enormous cost, until 1847. There was then an appeal to the Judicial Committee, and in March, 1849, FOUR YEARS from the commencement, the Judicial Committee decided there was no ground for the action, and the defendant was set free, subject only to the enormous costs of the suit.”

I may add that, notwithstanding the new rules to which the Queen's Advocate, has referred, these evils still exist. The Bishop of Killaloe has alluded to the existing system in our Ecclesiastical Courts in language of the strongest reprobation. His Lordship, in a pamphlet published in 1859 (Speech of his lordship, then Bishop of Cork, in the House of Lords, March 22, 1859. Parker and Son, West Strand, 1860.) thus emphatically writes:—

"I believe that the present state of the Ecclesiastical law and the Ecclesiastical Courts in England tends greatly to uphold the influence of evil by affording shelter to grave delinquents, and obstructing the effectual punishment of immorality, and the expulsion of religious error," p. 23.

Under these circumstances, it must be conceded that the administration of our Ecclesiastical laws has become paralysed, and is prejudicial to the spiritual and to the temporal interests of the Church, and consequently requires amendment. The next question then is, what is the best line of conduct to be pursued; and I unhesitatingly declare that it would be an utter delusion to attempt to amend the present system. The only mode of dealing with the evil is to abolish that system and to establish a new one in its place. There is one English prelate who has dealt with this subject in a most able, comprehensive, and liberal spirit; and whose opinions will, I believe, be cordially approved of by every person sincerely desirous of making the Ecclesiastical Courts what they ought to be, courts of justice. I allude to the Archbishop of York, who, in the Convocation of the Province of York in March, 1865, is reported in the *Guardian* newspaper thus to have said—

"The mode of proceeding in the Ecclesiastical Courts in dealing with cases led to endless and countless delays and constant mis-carriages of justice, and he knew that if there should be one erring brother causing a scandal to Christ's flock out of many who were doing their duty faithfully, it was not in the power of the Bishops to bring such offender to justice without very long delays and very considerable expense, which had to be borne by himself. First, as to delays, he should like to see the Ecclesiastical Courts, in their rules and proceedings, assimilated to our common law courts; and then it would not be possible for a man to dodge and put off his trial by dilatory pleas, which had to be answered by tedious replications, but upon a certain day he would be brought to his trial, and the public mind would then be satisfied either of his innocence or of his punishment; the thing would be brought to a close and the scandal removed. With reference to the article of expense, whilst every other court was maintained by the country, in these cases the Bishop maintained the court and set the machinery in motion at his own expense. He was aware that in a distant diocese at a distant time the Bishop had a case brought under his notice causing the greatest scandal to the Church, and he was requested to bring the offender to justice. The Bishop, however, replied that he had already spent £4,000 upon another case in the same year, and he was unable to proceed, because he could not bear the cost. If he had to move in the matter some other parties must take upon themselves the expense. Nothing was then done, and the scandal remained. Such cases as these were practical grievances; they were not frequent, but the evil was a real one. It was not the Court of Final Appeal that erred in these cases. The delays and the expense and the cumbrous procedure of the Ecclesiastical Courts, which had descended to us from past generations, should be swept away in order that simple justice might be simply done. He would not be thought to wish for more powerful machinery to bear upon the clergy, but he knew that it was the feeling of all the Church, of the clergy, and of the laity, that when a great scandal arose it should be inquired into by a strictly legal examination as to the guilt or innocence of the party accused. Such a power was essential to the safe conduct of the Church in whose welfare they all took so deep an interest. . . . One necessary provision would be, in any alteration of the Ecclesiastical Courts, that the rules and course of procedure should be assimilated to the common law courts which worked so well."

The wisdom and practical sagacity of his Grace the Archbishop of York in these remarks have been conclusively established by the reform which has been effected in the Irish courts and registries. During the last twelve months the procedure in these tribunals has been assimilated to that of the Courts of Equity and Common Law. In 1864 the Irish Primate, with the concurrence of the Archbishop of Dublin and their suffragan prelates, introduced a bill into the House of Lords giving absolute power to the two Archbishops, with the consent of the Crown, to make such alterations in the procedure and practice of the Ecclesiastical Courts and Registries as they might think proper. The bill was supported by Lord Westbury, who was then Lord Chancellor, and it was afterwards introduced in the House of Commons by Mr. Whiteside and Sir Hugh Cairns; and it ultimately passed. I mention this fact as showing that, whether as regards the late or the present Government, no opposition need be anticipated from Parliament as to a radical reform of the Ecclesiastical Courts and registries of this country. As soon as the bill became law, I received instructions to settle the rules and orders under the act. I found that, while in Ireland there were twelve Bishops, there were twenty-six courts and registries, each with its Vicar-General and other officers. I also found that the mode of procedure was as inefficient as tedious, and as expensive as it is in this country, and that, in point of fact, it amounted to a denial of justice. In order to remove these evils it was determined to abolish the old procedure, its forms of instruments and tables of fees, and to introduce a practice like that which prevails in the

superior courts. The result has been that the twenty-six courts and registries are reduced to twelve. The Provincial Vicar-Generals must be Queen's Counsel or barristers of fifteen years' standing, and the Diocesan Vicar-Generals must be barristers of six years' standing. There is now one uniform mode of procedure—that of petition and answer for the hearing of all Ecclesiastical causes and other proceedings, and of suits for divorce *à mensa et thoro*, and for alimony; witnesses must be examined *viva voce*, and counsel and solicitors have the like privileges as in the superior courts. If suitors wish to have the evidence taken down, a sworn shorthand-writer must be employed, and his notes filed in the registry as of record. Every judgment must be written; the Judge must assign his reasons for that judgment; he must sign it, and it must also be filed as of record in the registry. There is, in fact, no reason under the present mode of procedure why any question of doctrine, or of immorality, should not be disposed of in as easy and in as inexpensive a manner as in an action on a bill of exchange in the Superior Courts. For the determination of questions raised by consent, parties may state their respective cases in a Special Case, which must be argued and conducted like special cases in the Superior Courts. Under the old system the fees on institution or collation to benefices varied in some cases from 11 per cent. upon the net annual value to 17 per cent.; but now they do not exceed 5 per cent. upon one year's net income. It was found that in some dioceses two guineas were illegally charged for letters of orders, but that charge has been reduced to 10s., the canonical fee. In one diocese 15s., and in another diocese £1 1s. was the lowest charge for a marriage licence; but now 6s. is all that a poor man is required to pay, while the fee is 15s. to a tradesman, and £2 to an esquire. Again, no fees have been sanctioned for any Bishop's secretary or seal-keeper. The Irish prelates do not receive one farthing from any fees paid into their courts and registries; and it is only fair and right for me to state that those right rev. prelates, in order to carry out these reforms, have voluntarily resigned their visitation fees, their fees upon institutions, collations, and commissions, and they have also given up the patronage of fourteen chancellorships and registrarships. That there may be no misapprehension as to the efficient working of this system, I have written to the Provincial Vicars-General of Armagh and Dublin upon the subject; and I will read their answers to the meeting:—

“3, Merrion-square, Dublin, October 1, 1866.

“My dear Dr. Stephens—As Vicar-General of the Province of Armagh, and as Delegate in Appeals from other Ecclesiastical Courts, I have now for one year had experience of the machinery of the new Ecclesiastical rules and orders; and I find, as regards contentious business in court, that the very great advantages of cheapness, despatch, and simplicity, have been most effectually obtained; and as regards non-contentious business, that the forms are well drawn, and the accompanying directions exceedingly clear. There can be no doubt that the present system is a great, and for the suitors a most beneficial, improvement upon that for which it was substituted.

Yours sincerely, “JOHN F. BALL.”

“Lough Bawn, Collinstown, October, 2, 1866.

“My dear Stephens—Before the passing of the Act 27-28 Vic., c. 54, complaints of the Ecclesiastical Courts were universal.

“1. The pleadings and written depositions, with exceptions to witnesses, &c., were so tedious and lengthy that parties, when a cause was ripe, frequently could not have a hearing from inability to take out office copies, the cost of which often exceeded several hundreds of pounds. And if the cause were heard, and an appeal were interposed, the expense of the transmiss and new brief for the delegates was equally oppressive—in short, no poor person could have sought redress in an Ecclesiastical Court. These evils have been altogether corrected; the proceedings are now more expeditious, short, and simple than in an action at common law, and the cause must be very heavy, the costs of which would now amount to £100 in an Ecclesiastical Court.

“2. Although the fees on presentations, inductions, purchase of glebe, exchanges, leases, consecrations, &c., &c., were said to be defined in some offices, everybody in fact charged what he pleased, there being no check. The Registrar, whose duty it was to tax, could not be expected to tax the Proctor too closely, he being in general the paymaster of the Registrar.

“3. The Judges were usually clergymen, and however competent they might be as to spiritual questions, they were generally thought prejudiced even in those, and not well versed in legal questions of a secular character. This has been provided against, and I have never heard any one complain of the change.

“4. The Advocates and Proctors capable of practising in the Diocesan Courts situate in remote places were so few that suitors in many instances could not procure counsel. This has been remedied.

“5. In many of the courts there was not sufficient business to support officers or practitioners of a respectable class, and consequently the courts themselves were despised. This

has been remedied by the consolidation of those courts, and where there is business the officers are better remunerated than before.

"6. The new system of pleading and practice omits all the old prolix and perplexing forms, and brings the parties to issue at once, thus following the improvements in the courts of law and equity, or rather going beyond them; for the pleading and practice in the Ecclesiastical Courts, now, are considered by the profession here to be better than those of other courts.—I remain, my dear Stephens, most sincerely yours,

"GEORGE BATTERSBY."

The PRESIDENT: I do hope and trust that that sound of hissing will not again be heard. There are three Sections now sitting, and if any gentlemen present do not find matter of sufficient interest in this, they can resort to another.

DIOCESAN SYNODS IN RELATION TO CONVOCA- TION AND PARLIAMENT.

THE VEN. ARCHDEACON BICKERSTETH READ THE FOLLOWING PAPER:—

The design of this paper is to treat of Diocesan Synods in relation to Convocation and Parliament. But I think that I shall best evolve these relations by speaking generally of Diocesan Synods themselves, as to their *authority*, their *constitution*, and their *use*.

It is unnecessary for me, in such a presence as this, to dwell at any length upon the original principles of Church government. I assume at once that the Church is a Divine institution, and that though a spiritual, she is also a visible, incorporation. And as no society can hold together without some order and government, so from the beginning the Church has been ordered by spiritual rulers, receiving their commission and authority from Christ Himself. This was the condition of the primitive Church, existing indeed in the commonwealth, though not of the commonwealth. But when the powers of this world became Christian, new relations arose; and the Church in Christian States then became a part of the commonwealth, and was cared for and protected by her laws.

The adjustment of the relations thus created soon became a source of grave question and of bitter controversy. Some have not only excluded the civil magistrate from any authority over the Church; but have even raised the highest spiritual ruler in the Church to a supremacy over the civil magistrate. Others have run into the opposite but no less dangerous error, either of investing the civil magistrate with all spiritual power, or of allowing the exercise of it to all Christians without distinction. The first of these errors manifestly tends to create divisions in the State, and to excite subjects to rebel against the civil ruler. The second, in either of its forms, strikes at the root of all Church authority. Under the one form its tendency must be to lay the Church at the feet of the State; under the other, to destroy all order and discipline; under both forms, to imperil the deposit of the faith, and to overthrow the Sacraments of the Church.¹

I am not about to discuss these difficult questions further than to remind you how admirably the relations of Church and State in our own country have been defined in our Statute-book, in the celebrated preamble to the Act on the "Restraint of Appeals."² It does not there affirm that this Realm of England is an empire governed by King,

(1) Archbishop Potter on Church government.

(2) Statute 24 Henry VIII., cap. 12.

Lords, and Commons; but an empire governed by one "supreme head and King, unto whom a body politick compact of all sorts and degrees of people, divided in terms and by names of Spirituality and Temporality, been bounden and owen to bear, next to God, a natural and humble obedience." It then goes on to define the proper limits of the power of each of these parts of the body politick, the Spirituality and Temporality; and to affirm that "both their authorities and jurisdictions do conjoin together in the due administration of justice, the one to help the other." But we shall best understand the true position of the Church by considering the authority which belongs to her as of Divine right, and irrespective of any of the accidents of a State connexion.

From the beginning the Bishop of each Diocese had power by Divine commission to govern the Church within those limits. But in the administration of this rule he was assisted by his Presbyters, who sat with him as his Assessors, and were, in fact, his Council.¹ All the Ecclesiastical authorities bear witness to the honour and respect that were paid to the Presbyters in the early Church. They acted in conjunction with their Bishop, who scarcely did anything in his diocese without their advice and concurrence. This the Bishop did, not because he had no ruling superiority over his Presbyters, or because he was bound by any Ecclesiastical canons to admit them into his counsels, but, as we see from the well-known example of St. Cyprian,² of his own free will, and because he judged it most expedient. Therefore it is that St. Ignatius describes Presbyters as "the counsellors and assistants of the Bishop;" and St. Chrysostom as "the court and sanhedrim of the Presbyters;" and St. Cyprian as the "venerable bench of the clergy." The Bishop was, of course, the head and prince of this Ecclesiastical senate; but he did not of his own motion regulate the government and discipline of the Church without their advice and consent. For this reason special places of honour were assigned to the Presbyters in the early Diocesan Synods. The Bishop sat in the centre on a high throne, and the Presbyters on either side of him, according to their seniority, on somewhat lower thrones; and so universal was this custom, that the expression "they of the second throne" was a synonym for Presbyters. There is a beautiful vision recorded by Gregory Nazianzen, in which he says, "I thought I saw myself (the Bishop) sitting on the high throne, and the Presbyters, that is the guides of the Christian flock, sitting on both sides of me on lower thrones, and the Deacons standing by them."³ This vision of Gregory and other evidences show that Deacons and Sub-Deacons also were summoned if it was the custom of the place. In some cases "approved"⁴ Deacons only were invited, and "laymen" also "of good repute."⁵ But it was of the very essence of the Diocesan Synod from

(1) Here is the definition of a Diocesan Synod by B. Gavanti. "*Diœcesana Synodus est congregatio legitima, quam facit Episcopus cum Clericis sibi subditis in suâ diœcesi, de iisque tractat quæ curæ suæ pastoralis incumbunt.*"—*B. Gavanti Præcis Etactissima*.

(2) At the very first entrance into my bishopric, I resolutely determined not to do anything of mine own private judgment, without your counsel and the people's consent.—*Cyprian, Ep. xiv.*

(3) *Greg. Nazianz. Somn. de Eccles. Anastasiæ, Orat. xx.* See Bingham.

(4) *Probabiles.*

(5) *Bonæ conversationis.*

the beginning that every Priest of the Diocese, having cure of souls, should form a constituent part of it.

These Diocesan Synods, in which, as we have seen, the Presbyters occupied so prominent a position, were the first Councils, after the Church assumed a regular and permanent form of government. And most important were their functions. When a vacancy in the see occurred, it was by the voice of this venerable bench that the new Bishop was elected, and they were associated with him in all matters concerning the faith and discipline of the Church. Each Diocese was thus an independent community, though confederate with the rest of Christendom. It was not until the middle of the second century that the Church began to unite in larger Synods, where the Bishops, accompanied by some of their clergy, appeared to represent their Dioceses. The Diocesan Synod was the primitive typical element. Provincial, National, and General Councils followed, as the Church expanded, and as the necessities of the Church required them.

For many ages all the clergy were alike subject to the decrees of the Synods. But in course of time, through the influence of the Church of Rome, exemptions were granted in favour of the Monastic and Capitular bodies; and those exemptions, together with a growing unwillingness on the part of the laity to submit to the decrees of the Synods unless they had the Royal authority, contributed in many places to the suspension of Synods, although, as Van Espen observes, "through their omission the discipline of the Church has greatly suffered, and abuses have taken their origin."

In this country Diocesan Synods were continued down to the time of the Reformation. Since then, with a few recorded exceptions, such as those of St. Asaph in 1561 and in 1683, and in Norwich in 1580, and two conspicuous examples in recent times, at Oxford in 1850, and at Exeter in 1851, they have fallen into abeyance. Not that the Act of Submission¹ was intended, even indirectly, to restrain the free action of these lesser Synods. I venture to affirm that the right and power of a Bishop to hold his Diocesan Synod are unaffected by this or any other Statute. It is true that the Act in question refers to canons "Provincial or Synodal." But the introduction of this term is easily explained. It is upon Convocation that the Statute lays its hand. But the keen-sighted framers of the Act had doubtless an eye to the fact that at that time the Convocation comprehended two characters—*first*, an assembly of the clergy gathered together by Royal writ for the purpose of taxing themselves for subsidies to the Crown; and, *secondly*, a Provincial Synod. For convenience sake the two functions were at that time united in the same assembly. Hence the introduction of the terms "Provincial or Synodal," the object evidently being to bring all that might be transacted by this body, in its two-fold capacity, under the cognizance and control of the Crown, and to restrain the clergy from passing canons in Convocation, under cover as though they were the acts of a Provincial Synod. But the whole structure of the Act shows that it refers to Provincial Synods, and not to Diocesan. Indeed, inasmuch as the Diocesan Synods are themselves by the canon law of Christendom restrained by the Provincial, it is obvious that it was quite unnecessary for

the Crown to interfere with their action. The legality of Diocesan Synods is, in fact, distinctly recognised by various Acts passed subsequently to the Act of Submission.¹ Moreover, the *Reformatio Legum*, itself the product of the Act of Submission, directs the annual holding of Diocesan Synods by the Bishops, and thus proves that there is no impediment created by the Act. Indeed, no one but a very advanced Erastian could suppose that there was.

Why then, it will be asked, have Diocesan Synods fallen into disuse in England since the Reformation? It was the result, as I imagine, of the rebound of this Church and nation from the Papal supremacy. Rome had taken to herself a power unwarranted by the example of the primitive Church; and when this power was wrested from her by the vigorous arm of a Tudor sovereign, something of that excess went over to the Civil Power. The overthrow of that baneful usurpation encouraged the vigorous development of a central civil power, which, though it aimed at curbing the aggressions of Rome, rather than at abridging the rights and liberties of the Church, has nevertheless impeded this primitive action; and thus, as I venture to think, our Church has been crippled, and has failed to exercise her just influence in the nation. If we were to regard only one object of Diocesan Synods—namely, that of promulgating the Canons and Decrees of the Provincial, we might doubt whether their revival would be worth contending for. But if we regard them as a means of strengthening the hands of the Bishops—of recovering for Presbyters their primitive rank, and their due influence in the Church—of encouraging and directing zeal and self-devotion—of uniting and consolidating the action of the Church—of providing in a safe and constitutional manner for lay co-operation—and of bringing a great moral influence to bear both upon Convocation and upon Parliament,—then I would say, in the glowing words of Gavanti, “*nobiliorem, utiliorem, jucundiorum, haud scio an habeat Episcopus actionem, si ea rite fit, quam Diocesanam Synodalem.*”²

“*Si ea rite fit.*” In seeking, then, the revival of Diocesan Synods, we must look carefully to ancient precedents. The new can never come safely, except from and through the old. But in adapting these precedents to our own constitution in Church and State, it seems to me that the Bishop must be left to his own discretion, as to both the occasion and the frequency of these Synods. We must not forget that the Church cannot march with the same freedom in a land like our own, where she is interwoven with the State, as in countries where there is no such connexion. There are impediments arising out of what I may call the stereotyped footsteps of these very Synods themselves. For I suppose that the Visitations of the Ordinary are State Diocesan Synods; and that the Cathedral Chapters still reflect, though somewhat dimly, the ancient vision of Gregory Nazianzen; and that the *conge d’elire* still glances at the privilege once exercised by the Presbyters in Synod of choosing their Bishop. In these institutions we have the primitive Diocesan Synod, fixed as it were and set in amber under the influence of the Civil Power, notwithstanding the changes in other things which, (as Hooker says) “tract

(1) See 31 Henry VIII., cap. 14, and 1 Elizabeth, cap. 2, sec. 23.

(2) B. Gavanti. *Praxis Exactissima*.

of time and the course of the world hath brought." Another impediment arises out of the enormous size of some of our Dioceses. But I may be pardoned for saying that the example of this large and well ordered Congress is a proof that this difficulty is not insurmountable, even if it be not soon removed, as we trust it may be, by the very obvious course of a moderate subdivision of Dioceses, and the appointment of Suffragan Bishops, and occasionally at least by a gathering together of the Clergy in the smaller divisions of the Arch-deaconries. This difficulty and the mode of meeting it are no new thing. It occurred to the Emperor Charlemagne. Thomassinus informs us that Charlemagne directed the holding of Synods annually, in order that each Presbyter might each year give an account of his ministry to his Bishop. But, inasmuch as this would occupy too long a time, the Emperor further directed that the Parishes of each Diocese should be arranged in groups, and that each group should send its clergy in turn to the Episcopal residence, there to spend a few days with the Bishop, where they might be saturated with that richness of heavenly wisdom and love, which might avail towards their ministering their cures in the most sacred manner, and to the recovering of their life and conversation to the primitive holiness of the faithful.

"These gatherings," Thomassinus adds, "differed of course from a Synod. But they were so much the more convenient for instructing the Clergy in heavenly discipline, as it is the more easy to instruct the few in the course of a week, than the many in the course of a day or two."¹

Let me here, in the name of my brethren, express publicly our thankfulness to our right reverend fathers for the opportunities which they so freely offer to the clergy for seeking their counsel and guidance. The annual meetings of the Rural Deans and other Officers of the Diocese under the Bishop's roof are most advantageous to the Church, as well as those larger gatherings instituted in some Dioceses for the strengthening and increasing both of the external work of the Church, and of the inner life both in Clergy and people. But the necessities of the Church seem to me to point more and more plainly to the primitive precedent of regularly organised Diocesan Synods, assembled with more or less frequency, as the Bishop shall see fit, or the circumstances of the Church may require; at which Synod the Bishop or his representative shall preside, with all the Presbyters of his Diocese, having cure of souls, as his Council. This is the primitive and constitutional Synod, to which the Bishop can invite the Deacons if he shall see fit, and laymen also of known worth and learning and ability to take part in the proceedings in certain sessions. Let us only consider for a moment what influence such Synods would exercise. They would give to the Clergy the opportunity of free discussion, with a controlling power in the Bishop, both as to the subjects to be discussed, and as to their final determination. Indeed, the very principle of the Diocesan Synod is "the liberty of the clergy, the authority of the Bishops."² Nor need the Bishop fear any real loss of power. On the contrary, if he comes down somewhat from the autocratic position

(1) *Thomassinus, de Synodis Diœcesanis, Part ii., lib. iii.*

(2) *Libertas parochorum, autoritas Episcoporum.—Thomassin de Diœc., Synod.*

of a Church and State Bishop, he is borne upwards again with a new power, and with a more clear recognition of his pastoral and paternal character, supported upon the broad living basis of the Presbyterate of his Diocese, who would then feel that even the humblest of them, under the guidance of the Spirit of Truth, might shed some light upon the deliberations.¹ These considerations did not escape the vigilant eye of Lord Chancellor Bacon, who, perceiving the disadvantage of a sole and unassisted exercise of their authority by the Bishops, urged such a reformation as this, recommending it upon the ground that it might be accomplished "*sine strepitu*, without any perturbation at all; that it would give strength to the Bishops, countenance to the inferior degrees of prelates or ministers, and the better issue to those causes that shall pass."²

These Synods would, moreover, have great avail in correcting irregularities, whether of omission or of commission, without the intervention of the harsh processes of mere authority and law. Who can doubt but that under their influence such palpable evils as Holy Baptism administered in private—infrequent Communion—the neglect of Holy Days, and especially of Ascension Day—the omission of the Athanasian Creed, and many others, not peculiar to any particular school, but the legacy of a neglectful age, would, under God's blessing, pass away? Nor let it be deemed presumptuous to think that by their means the Ritual question might settle itself without State interference; and wild speculation on things divine, and rash and unscrupulous criticism of the Sacred Text, might be so discountenanced by the moral sense of a united Church, as to render comparatively unnecessary the formal condemnations of a Provincial Synod.

The principle by which these discussions should be guided is excellently laid down in that old rule of the Church—"Quodsi forsitan aliquis nostrum aliter quam dicta fuerint senserit, sine aliquo scrupulo contentionis in nostrum omnium collatione ea de quibus ipse dubitaverit conferenda deducat, qualiter, Domino mediante, aut doceri possit, aut doceat."³ An admirable rule for all deliberative assemblies.

As to the presence of faithful laymen in these Synods, nothing can be clearer than this, that from the very first sacred Synod at Jerusalem downward they have enjoyed this privilege—not, indeed, by any process of election, or as forming a constituent part of the Synod—nor yet for the purpose of interfering in any questions of doctrine, which questions, by the voice of the Church universal and by the constitution of this Realm, should be interpreted by the Spirituality;—but that they may support the Spirituality in the guardianship of the faith, and assist the Synod in certain periods of its sessions, and in certain portions of its work.⁴

(1) Ubi vides ultro citroque res fuisse prius ventilatas, sedulâ collatione, quam quidquam concluderetur; suus tamen Episcopo illibatus constabat principatus sapientiæ et authoritatis. Ita sane, sed ut non nesciret tamen cœlitus illustrari a Spiritu veritatis humiliores quandoque, et despicabiliores quosque et per eos non nunquam refundi non parum luminis in inferiores.—*Thomassinus, De Synod. Diœc.*

(2) Bacon on the Pacific of the Church.

(3) *Thomassinus, de Synod. Diœces., clxxv. sec. 2.*

(4) It is enough on this point to refer to the decrees of the Council of Tarragona, A.D. 516; and of the sixteenth Toledan Council, A.D. 731. Even Pope Benedict XIV., although with some reluctance, admits that it was not altogether foreign to ancient custom that laymen

Here, then, in the Diocesan Synod rightly constituted, is a legitimate opportunity for faithful laymen to co-operate with the Spirituality. We of the clergy know of how much practical value their opinions are, especially when they can be expressed freely, and apart from political influences. We have cause to be thankful for an increasing number of enlightened and faithful sons of the Church in Parliament; and their sentiments are observed anxiously and carefully by Churchmen. But it is difficult for the Church to make herself felt in Parliament. The utterances are those of individuals, and too often they differ widely amongst themselves. We want a consentient voice, and not divergent opinions. Parliament represents the nation, and if we would raise the tone of Parliament on Church matters, we must act upon the nation. And one amongst other means for effecting this is to let the nation know what the mind of the Church is. That mind can never be known till the Church speaks out through her Synods. Let the Church but make her voice to be heard, and she will be great and powerful, and "terrible as an army with banners."

Some have thought that for this purpose it would be desirable that the laity should be represented in our Convocations. But such a change would be nothing short of a revolution. In the theory of our Constitution, as the Temporality is represented in Parliament, so the Spirituality is represented in Convocation; and a mixture in the latter body would disturb the balance, and deprive us of the advantage which we now possess in having a purely spiritual body to guard the doctrines of the Church. But the influence of the laity in our Diocesan Synods would materially strengthen the Provincial, while that of the whole body of the Presbyterate would do much towards remedying the present imperfect representation of the parochial clergy in Convocation. And the Spirituality would be shown to be now, as ever, "sufficient and meet of itself to administer all such duties as to their rooms spiritual do appertain." By the revival of the Diocesan Synods the present interval between the Ruridecanal Chapters and the Convocations would be bridged over. The Ruridecanal Chapters would strengthen the Diocesan Synods, and these, in their turn, the Provincial; and the whole moral and intellectual power of the Church of England be thus brought to bear upon the great council of the nation in Parliament.

I have but one word more to add. Let it not be supposed, from anything that I have said, that I have the slightest sympathy with those who would seek for, or regard with complacency, a separation of Church and State. Not, indeed, that I fear for the Church. The strength and security of the Church of England depends not upon the support of the State, but upon her fidelity to the truth. And if through the Divine help she abides faithful, then, even though the State should cast her off, she would still remain a blessing in the land; and, by the high education, the ability, and the piety of her clergy, would probably still maintain her superiority. But the nation could not without tremendous peril separate itself from such a Church

should be admitted to be present at Diocesan as well as at Provincial Synods. We know, moreover, that in our own British Church, in a Synod held under David, Bishop of Menevia, A.D. 519, the chief laity and people were gathered from all parts of Wales to join with him and his clergy in condemning the Pelagian heresy.

as ours. It would abandon its first and most solemn duty. It would forfeit the favour of God. For the sake, then, of this realm and people of England, may the union of Church and State long be maintained! May our beloved National Church long be preserved the bulwark of our throne, the guardian of our liberties, the glory of our land! But the events which have recently occurred, both at home and in our Colonies, should not be without their warning. They compel us to apply a careful analysis, and to separate the accidents of the Church from the Church herself. They make it necessary that we should look, not to Acts of Parliament, but to the "holy mountains" for our foundation. So that if, in the providence of God, and to punish us for our neglect of His mercies, the State should withdraw its support, the Church may not be left without some knowledge and experience of the principles of self-legislation;—principles which are to be found in Holy Scripture, and in the writings of the Fathers, and in the decrees of the Universal Church from the beginning.

THE REV. CANON TREVOR READ THE FOLLOWING PAPER:—

Of the many rapid developments of our age, hardly one has effected such a leap out of darkness into light as the movement for Synodal Action. When I was ordained there was about as much chance of my receiving a summons to a Synod as of being picked up while bathing by an *Icthyosaurus Dolichodeirus*. A fine specimen was to be seen embedded in the blue lias of Convocation, but to talk of clothing its petrified bones with flesh and blood seemed, to dignified and sagacious observers, almost a qualification for Bedlam. I cannot better describe the general state of feeling among the higher authorities than by repeating a remark of the Dean of York—not our present very reverend superior, but a shrewd discriminating dignitary of an earlier deposit—on the occasion of my own election as one of the Proctors for our Metropolitan Chapter. "We have made a very good choice," he said; "one is a High Churchman, the other a Low. They are both great talkers, and we are sending them to a place where they will never be allowed to say a word!" Unfortunately for what was then called the peace of the Church, I was bent on disappointing this oracle. The Dean had not done justice to our talking powers. I managed not only to speak, but to move the election of a Prolocutor that we might proceed to business. It was my first and last speech in Convocation. We were prorogued on the spot; the Chapter-house doors were shut and barred, and the spiritual lock-out lasted thirteen years. The Chapter of York lost not a moment in unseating the Proctor who ventured to think his office a reality and not a sham. They had had enough of great talkers, and among the many positive excellencies which have distinguished my successors in the seat ever since, the negative recommendation has not been absent, that neither of them has ever once opened his mouth.

Such was the state of feeling nineteen years ago. Yet, not only have I lived to see the Prolocutor whom I then proposed formally installed in

his chair, but within the last three days, the Archbishop of Canterbury, preaching before your Grace and the largest representation of the Anglican Episcopate ever convened among us since the Reformation, enumerated the revival of Convocation among the most striking proofs of the vitality and renewed energy of the Church of England. In those words, my Lord Archbishop, the long craving of my heart on the question of Convocation was quenched and satisfied for ever. The revival of Convocation is universally recognized and approved; and we may now turn with quickened ardour to the question of the Diocesan Synod.

This question was started amongst us contemporaneously with the Convocation movement, and meetings were held at Derby and London and other places; but we could not get people to fight two battles at once, and this movement was lost for the time in the wake of Convocation. I recall, however, with peculiar satisfaction the comfort which I then received from an eminent layman, whose well-known face is no longer among us, but of whom everyone thinks with affection and gratitude whenever Convocation is mentioned. Our dear friend Mr. H. Hoare often told me that it was from the Derby meeting for Diocesan Synods that he gained his first clear insight into the Synodal question, and saw the impossibility of admitting a lay element into Convocation. The time is now come when the Diocesan question must receive the attention then thought to be premature. As its early advocates always foresaw, Convocation is not adequate alone to the proper utterance of the Church's mind. I believe that as things are, Convocation has reached the end of its tether, and if not reinforced from below, the advantage already won will be in danger of disappearing under the reaction of a great disappointment.

We never at any time shut our eyes to the defects in Convocation objected by our opponents: they tell us that it represents the clergy but imperfectly, and the laity not at all; and therefore it is a mockery and a sham. But this argument is quite as applicable to the House of Commons as to the older and better constituted Chamber of Convocation. The House of Commons represents the electoral classes imperfectly, and the non-electoral ones not at all. These defects do not avail to silence the House of Commons; and I often wonder why Conservative and constitutional members are not a little more tolerant of similar features in their elder sister.

Convocation, like Parliament and every other representative institution which is not a mere delegation, has a direct and an indirect constituency. It represents directly the classes by whose votes it is constituted, but it represents indirectly the whole population for whose benefit the suffrage is intrusted to the electors. In Convocation the spiritual estate is represented directly, and the temporality indirectly. In Parliament the temporality engrosses the direct representation and the spirituality comes in for the indirect. This is in exact accordance with their respective functions in the constitution of Church and State. We are one nation under one sovereign, having two great aspects or interests, neither altogether absent from the sphere of the other, yet each predominant in its own. This is the theory of the British Constitution, and it is one not to be lightly cast away.

Still we can see as well as others the practical deficiencies, and are as ready as others to reform them. The representation of the Clergy in Convocation is confessedly imperfect; it is less perfect in the province of Canterbury than in our own, because in the North we have watchfully preserved the old archidiaconal liberties, which our Southern brethren, with the trustfulness which follows the sun, have surrendered to their Bishops. They have lately tried to remedy the mistake by reforming the constitution of the Lower House;—a reform, by the way, which falls greatly short of the archidiaconal representation once belonging to them as well as to us. But though we Synodal men are often called Church Radicals, I doubt if it is ever reform in the constitution which is needed, so much as reform in the way of using the constitution. Before we alter the constitution of Convocation with a view to a larger measure of clerical representation, it might be well to inquire how far the existing suffrage is valued and exercised. I have been present at an election where three individuals chose the Proctors for a whole Archdeaconry. I recollect once getting two returned on my own nomination without a single constituent being present. Things have greatly improved since then, and are improving every day. Still it is not often that more than a quarter—never, perhaps, half—the electors take the trouble to vote. A large proportion of *ex-officio* seats also in both provinces are constantly left unfilled. So long as so much apathy or dislike remains among the existing electors, I do not think the time has come for an enlargement of the representation. It is all very well to say that the apathy will disappear as Convocation becomes more powerful, but Convocation cannot attain to moral power,—and will certainly not be allowed any legal power—till it can present itself to the nation as *de facto*, no less than *de jure*, the Church of England by representation. In my judgment a reform should begin with the electoral bodies,—not the representative ones.

What we now want is the Diocesan Synod to instruct and invigorate Convocation. If the Clergy were in the habit of meeting personally in the Diocese, they would quickly take their proper interest in the proceedings of the Province where they appear by representation. Convocation would be looked to to give effect to the Diocesan Synod. A stream of new blood would at once be infused into its veins: the elections would be attended, the best men elected, and their proceedings watched with the interest always accorded in this country to genuine representative institutions. With such a power at their backs the small band of Diocesan Proctors in Canterbury Convocation would be an efficient counterpoise to its many dignitaries. In our own the voice of the clergy would be omnipotent. No structural changes are needed, as I think, in either, to give full effect to the mind of the diocese, if the diocese would only make up its mind and be at the pains to enunciate it. To my mind, then, the Diocesan Synod is the constitutional and practical remedy for improving the representation of the clergy in Convocation.

The same institution would give weight and point to the indirect representation of the laity. That the temporality should be directly represented in Convocation is inconsistent with its fundamental principle, and would involve the abrogation of its relations with Par-

liament, and the dissolution of the union between Church and State. This I tried to show at the Synodal Meeting in Derby and at the Manchester Church Congress, and I must not repeat the argument here. But the Diocesan Synod has no relations with Parliament, and no legislative power. Here the laity may sit with the greatest practical advantage, and without any violation of principle. For, while I grant that the Diocesan Synod is primarily and of necessity an assembly of the clergy, there is nothing in history or law to exclude an association of the laity. In fact, we have traces of the closest communion in every period of the Church, and in the earliest it must have been universal. Suppose it now to be restored among ourselves, is it not obvious that the laity would exercise in the Diocesan Synod a very powerful influence on both Houses of Convocation? They would have the opportunity of pressing their views on the Bishops and the clergy with all the weight of their local experience and position. At present the only place where a layman can be heard on Church matters is Parliament, and Parliament is daily becoming the last place where a Church layman would wish to make the attempt. In the Diocesan Synod the lay mind might come fully and freely into contact with the clerical, and by mutual discussion elicit the mind of the Church. The layman who had taken part in these debates could never after look coldly or askance on Convocation. He would have met its members on the same question before, whispered the Bishop, button-holed the Archdeacon, and harangued the clergy into choosing Proctors of the proper sort. All this would largely increase the indirect representation of the temporal estate in Convocation.

On Parliament the effects would be similarly beneficial. Many Peers and M.P.'s might be expected to sit in the Diocesan Synod, and the clergy would thus enjoy the same advantage in impressing their opinions upon Parliament that the laity would obtain with regard to Convocation. The Diocesan Synod would act, in short, as a conference of Parliament and Convocation; the interchange and assimilation of opinion there effected would re-act on the views and temper of each body. Parliament would understand the Church, and the Church would be less distrustful of Parliament. Then, indeed, Convocation might become a great power, because its action would be national and its motives unsuspected. The manifold increasing unfitness of Parliament to deal with Church questions would induce it gladly to resign them to Convocation, if it could only be satisfied that Convocation might be trusted with the rights of the laity. On this point Parliament will never be satisfied till the Church laity set the example. The "Church influence in the House of Commons," to borrow the language of a right hon. friend at a former Congress,¹ "is emphatically a lay influence;" and to bring this influence into unity with the spiritual authority which claims to be heard in Convocation, we must get the two orders by whom they are exercised to co-operate in the Diocesan Synod.

Without dwelling longer on advantages which appear to me so obvious, I proceed to the constitution of a Diocesan Synod. And

(1) Mr. Napier at Norwich.

first I would observe, that it differs widely from the meeting of Archdeacons and Rural Deans at the Palace, which I have heard a Bishop describe as his Diocesan Synod. Valuable as those meetings doubtless are, they possess none of the conditions of a Synod, and can only do mischief by pretending to supply its place. In the first place, there is no lay element in those meetings; and in the second place there is no clerical element. For, though the dignitaries present are indeed clergymen, they have no authority to represent the clergy; they are there in a totally different capacity. Archdeacons and Rural Deans are the eyes and eyelets of the Bishop; they are *his* organs for the more effectual supervision of his charge. There can be no sort of objection to the Bishop collecting his scattered lenses every half-year into a telescope, and taking a closer look at the clergy. But it is a widely different thing to ask the clergy to look at the Bishop through the same instrument. The Bishop has hold of the right end of the telescope, and we of the wrong one. He sees us so clearly that we seem to him quite by his side, but to us who have to gaze up the inverted perspective, the Bishop diminishes to a point and is further off than ever. The very use of a Synod is to show the Bishop how things look in other eyes than his own, and therefore its functions can never be discharged by any adjustment of the "brightest and best" of the *oculi* and *ocelli episcoporum*.

For the same reason a Visitation is not a Synod, though a Synod might well enough precede or follow the Visitation. It is true that Bishops often begin their Visitation Charges with an expression of satisfaction at the opportunity of again taking counsel with the clergy. But it was never yet my good fortune to hear any counsel asked or given; nor in fact, since the sermon has been discontinued, is any other voice raised in the assembly than the Bishop's own—if I except the registrar's, whose *charge* is quite of another kind. As for taking the opinion of the meeting, we do not even indulge ourselves in a "hear, hear!" still less venture on a gentle "no, no!" Nor ought we to do so. A Visitation is not meant to invite discussion, but to administer discipline. The Charge (as the name denotes) was designed to give in charge to the clergy the orders of the Synod, with other directions of lawful authority. It is an occasion for the superior to promulgate his line of action, but it is not the place for an inferior to offer a word of counsel or remonstrance.

A Synodal meeting is as different from this as the veins from the arteries in the human body. Both are charged with the same fluid, both are ruled by the action of the same heart, but the one is the outward and the other the homeward current. From the Bishop, as the heart of the diocese, discipline flows out by Visitations, Archdeacons, and Rural Deans to the furthest extremity of the organization, but the vital current never returns by the same channel. It has become weakened and disintegrated by its own exertions: it needs to be conducted into the lungs and there purified and invigorated by fresh air. Then it goes back to fill the heart with fresh life, and issue out again in another vigorous tide of action. My lord, the Diocesan Synod is the Bishop's lungs: the strongest and purest heart cannot dispense with its refreshing function. Discipline deadens and becomes poisonous without discussion, and many an

episcopate has fallen suffocated behind its own vizor, which might have lived and left its mark on the age, if it could only have got now and then a mouthful of fresh air.

Another mistake is to suppose that a Diocesan Synod is a representative body. In the Provincial Synod the clergy of the second order appear by representatives, because the Bishops are the primary and constituent element of the Synod. In the Diocesan Synod the constituent element is the Priesthood: and just as every Bishop has an indefeasible right and duty in the Synod of the province, so has every Priest in that of the diocese. It is a trust which cannot be delegated to another. The Bishop is bound to require from everyone who holds spiritual mission from himself a direct account of his stewardship, and the Priest has a right, inherent in the canonical relation, to open his grief in the presence of his brethren and seek direction from their common head. The fundamental and essential idea of a Diocesan Synod is a consultation of the Bishop with the whole priesthood of his charge. Anything less than this is not a Synod, but a Committee or Chapter.

I can fancy one of the old opponents whom we had to fight on the Convocation question—some excellent dignitary of the good old safe class in the Church—exclaiming, “Why, you will bring out all the troublesome fellows in the diocese!” Yes, that is exactly the object! just as you go to the moors for rude blasts, and began to suspect your lungs when you find you cannot breathe out of a greenhouse. Troublesome! Yes, the very object of a Synod is to trouble those who will take no trouble while they are let alone. A troublesome clergyman is a great catch to a Bishop; he will tell him more of the diocese in half an hour at the Synod than he would learn in half a life of select meetings at the Palace. The prophets of smooth things are never wanting; it would be wise to listen occasionally to one in a rougher garment, even though he may not prophesy good concerning us but evil.

I lay it down, then, as a fundamental principle, that the entire priesthood must be cited to the Diocesan Synod. This is so in all Churches where they exist at all. To the objection of numbers I reply, let it be proved by experience that the clergy of any diocese are too numerous to meet their Bishop in Synod, and I cannot imagine the veriest optimist denying that that diocese needs to be sub-divided. How is discipline to be exercised when counsel is impossible? Who could defend personal relations between a superior of any sort and a body of inferiors too numerous to be assembled in his presence? Who that understands what is meant by the power of mission on the one side, and canonical obedience on the other, but must shudder to see those sacred relations simulated where there is no possibility of even deliberating on their exercise! Let it be known that a Bishop wishing to obtain the voice of his diocese is obliged to collect it by fragments in different places, as he repeats himself at a Visitation, and I am satisfied that ere long we should have every such fragment crested into a diocese. We should never consent to go on iterating our words three or four times over, before they could get fully out of the diocesan mouth; and even if we did, it is better to stammer than to be dumb. At present, however, I doubt the practical reality of this objection.

The experience of Convocation does not lead to the conclusion that the Synod would be too numerously attended, at least for some years to come. The Bishop would probably allow the clergy to appear by proxy—a simple mode of admitting representation, when desired, without trenching on the great principle of individual citation. A Rural Dean may thus become the genuine representative of those who choose to give him their proxies, while those who do not may attend for themselves.

So much for the Second order of the ministry. With regard to the Third, its numbers are too insignificant at present to call for discussion. If it should be increased, we may observe that Deacons never had the suffrage in Council, and being confessedly in a transition state, with no direct cure of souls, and not much experience of any kind, there would be no hardship in their keeping silence, yea, even from good words, until admission to the higher order shall open their lips.

The grand question is the Laity, and here our total want of experience compels us to speak with less confidence. From the first all Synodical men have insisted on the need of lay co-operation. None of us are satisfied with Parliamentary representation, and most of us believe a lay element impossible in Convocation. It remains, therefore, by one consent, for the Diocesan Synod. I, for one, cannot for a moment admit that anything less will satisfy the lay claim. A seat in Rural Chapter is an honour which, if I were a layman, I should unhesitatingly decline. Nothing short of coming face to face with the Bishop, in the presence of the whole clergy, can be of the least practical value.

The lay element, however, must clearly be representative. The original right of the lay parishioner is in the Vestry, but as the clergy, who have the original right in the Diocesan Synod, are represented in the higher Synod of the province by their Proctors, so may the laity be represented in the Diocesan Synod. To restrict them, as some have suggested, to a selection by the Bishop, would be fatal to the whole conception of a Synod. The days of nomination boroughs are ended, even in the State. The representative character can be acquired only in two ways;—first, by jurisdiction, which always implies an authority to speak for the subject, and secondly, by actual election of the constituent body. A nominee is only an echo, and no echoes—out of the sister island—can be expected, however frequent and far they prolong the utterance, to vary the original inspiration. Now, at present we have no lay Church dignitaries. I can recollect a lay Prebendary at Salisbury, and there is a lay Lord Abbot, I believe, in Ireland still, but in England the Ecclesiastical Commissioners have left us nothing higher than lay impropriators. Suppose we begin by giving them an *ex-officio* seat in Synod? It might be a good omen for chancels and perpetual curacies, and I throw it out for consideration.

Next are the churchwardens, the constitutional representatives of the Vestries, and therefore the proper basis of the elected element. Being more twice the number of the clergy, no one will expect them *all* to be summoned. A large proportion would be unable and unqualified to appear; but they may form a constituency to elect members of more leisure and higher qualifications. I should not be afraid

to give the churchwardens of every parish, or even the vestries, the right of choosing one *Synodsmen*,¹ qualified by having taken the Holy Communion three times at least in the year preceding his election. If this be deemed too large a representation, let the parishes be grouped, and two Synodsmen be returned by the churchwardens of each Rural Deanery. That would give us in this diocese somewhere about fifty lay Proctors, whom we may presume would present at least the cream, if not the entire lay secretion, of the diocese. In time the yield would be larger, and the number may be increased.

In the Scottish Church the Diocesan Synod is open to all male communicants, with the right of speech but not of vote. In the American Church the laity elect representatives who vote as a separate order, and the consent of both orders is necessary to the passing of any resolution. But on this point I will say no more, as one of the American Bishops is present, and perhaps he will give us some information.

[It must be borne in mind, however, that both in Scotland and America the Diocesan Synod is much more of a direct power than it could ever be in our legally Established Church. With us all the power would remain with Convocation and Parliament; a Diocesan Synod could do nothing beyond the canons of the province or the laws of the realm. It could not touch the doctrine, formularies, or discipline of the Church: its functions would be purely inquisitive and consultative. It could complain, petition, and suggest, but enact nothing. It could uphold the Bishop in the exercise of his legal authority, now often left in abeyance from the just and invincible dislike of all enlightened Englishmen to arbitrary power; and this alone would be a mighty gain to discipline. These Synods would be also courts of moderation, mutual explanation, and reconciliation: finally, they would be the most efficient organs for maturing and expressing public opinion, with a view to legislation when required. Still, they would exercise no binding action of their own, and there is less need, therefore, for discriminating the clerical and lay elements from each other. I should prefer that they should both debate and vote in common as one mixed body, though some may desire, and there would be no difficulty in providing that, on demand, the vote should be taken by orders.]

I am only anxious, in conclusion, to assert the great principle to which much of my life has been devoted, and which we have placed before all your eyes, for the last three days, in the largest letters we could find, that the safety of a great body like the Church, is to be found in consulting all its intelligent members—“*Salus in amplitudine consiliariorum!*”

DISCUSSION.

THE DEAN OF YORK, Prolocutor of the Convocation of the Northern Province: So much has been said, and so well said, by the Ven. the Archdeacon and Canon Trevor on the subject of Synodical Action, that I must ask this Congress to receive with

(1) The “Sidesmen,” still retained in some parishes, must surely be a corruption of this word, though, what was their synodal duty is far from clear.

(2) The motto (selected from Prov. xi. 14. and xxiv. 6.) placed over the President’s Chair in the Congress Hall.

special indulgence the few observations it is my duty to make, and to consider them as merely supplemental to the great principles which have been so ably set forth. It seems to me that if Diocesan Synods had no authority on which to fall back, there are many and sufficient reasons why they commend themselves, and are called for in the present position of the Church of England. Many circumstances have combined of late years, tending to unnationalize the Church, to weaken its connexion with the State, to throw it on its own resources; and the question seems to arise, whether the time has not come when we ought to revert to ancient principles and avail ourselves of those privileges of Church polity which come down to us from Apostolic ages, and which are sanctioned not less by primitive practice than by Ecclesiastical authority. I am not one who think that the Church will become extinct if severed from the State, nor am I prepared to contend that the Church will be the greater sufferer of the two, but I feel that if the Church is to hold her own she must be prepared to defend her own,—that she must put forth the full energies of her life and power,—that she must maintain her own distinctive teaching without fear or hesitation; and that the more she does this, the more will she draw around her her own members, and more especially that portion of the laity which is ever loyal to the Church when the Church is loyal to herself, and she will win the respect, even if she does not command the confidence, of those whose sympathies are with systems which are not hers. What more legitimate line of action can be taken than the calm and dispassionate discussion of a Diocesan Synod, convened and presided over by the Bishop of the diocese, taking counsel with those who are responsible for the welfare of its people's souls? If it be said that a Diocesan Synod would be too large and too multitudinous to lead to any practical good, I reply that such an argument is no argument against a Diocesan Synod, but that it is a very powerful argument why the area from which the Synod is drawn should be curtailed—the diocese divided, and the Episcopate extended. A Synod might be too large in Ripon or Chester, but it does not follow that it would be too large in a diocese half their size; and two Synods for Western Yorkshire, each presided over by their own Bishop, would be hailed by the Churchmen of the West Riding with feelings of thankfulness, and would be regarded by the Church as a wise measure of Ecclesiastical policy. That gatherings of the clergy have met in all ages, and in all parts of Christendom, I presume to be denied by none. We have had Synods (Ecumenical, National, Provincial, Diocesan: these have met with advantage to the Church, by the due exercise of their deliberative functions. After a lapse of two centuries, Convocation is something more than a name: it is summoned by the Queen's Writ; in the Southern Province it meets in the city of Westminster, and the Chapter House of York Minster is no longer the place where Convocation does *not* meet. On the deliberations of these Convocations great influence for good might be brought to bear through the medium of Synodical action. The Proctors would have a better knowledge of the minds of those they represent; they would be able to state more accurately the feeling which prevailed on the great Church questions of the day, and this would give Convocation a position it has hardly yet attained, as well as enable it so to develop the Church's system as to meet the increasing requirements of the age. That Synods are legal, the Venerable the Archdeacon has conclusively shown. A Synod could not deal with the temporalities of the Church, nor could it alter or enact a Canon; it is simply the Bishop of the diocese taking counsel with the clergy of the diocese on the spiritual affairs of the Church. This is the legal constitution of a Diocesan Synod; and if in early times great advantage arose from these Councils and Synods, if Apostles and Presbyters and Elders came together to consider matters affecting the Church's welfare, surely we may hope for similar advantage when grave questions occupy Christian minds. There is the extension of the Episcopate, at which I have glanced; then there is another question of vast importance, the demand of some, both amongst the laity as well as clergy, for it is not confined to one class, for an improved ceremonial in the Church of England. Then there is middle-class education, and spiritual destitution in a thickly peopled nation: all these subjects and many others might well be considered in a Diocesan Synod. As, then, the Church has had recourse to a long succession of Councils, as wise and holy men have come from the distant regions of Christendom to meet in these Councils, and as they sat in those sacred assemblies, offering prayer with one voice to heaven and resembling the apostolic band on the Day of Pentecost; so let the spiritual fathers and heads of the Church in these days call around them their spiritual sons, and we cannot doubt that the Spirit of Peace and Love will breathe upon them from heaven; that *τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ καταβαῖνον ὡσεὶ περιστερὰν* will brood over them “with silver wings, and her feathers like gold;” and that such deliberations, so guided, so assisted, so blessed, will

impart strength and vitality to the Church, will deepen the spiritual life and piety of its members, and will further the honour and glory of Almighty God.

MR. BERESFORD HOPE M.P.: I suppose the first idea that will occur to your minds will be, "Why want another speaker, after the two most able addresses which we have heard from the Prolocutor of Canterbury and the Prolocutor of York?" I conceive that I am put forward on the ground that this is a lay question as well as a clerical one. As a layman, therefore, as one mixed up in public life, as one that has to deal with all classes of men, whether they be Churchmen or Dissenters, and whatever their political views may be, I will address a few words to this meeting from a purely lay and political point of view. I claim to deal with the word "Synod" in a most elastic sense. I shall not discuss the organization of Synods from an ecclesiastical or legal point of view; but I shall plead as a layman, as a Churchman, as a member of the Lower House of Parliament, as a churchwarden, as a squire, for the establishment of periodical meetings of the clergy and laity of each diocese. We see that all other religious and political organizations have their meetings for consultation, and, whatever we may think of their objects, we cannot deny that their machinery for obtaining them is a very potent and efficient one for the purpose. Our enemies have their Liberation Society, and each denomination has its Conference, its Congregational Union, its Synod, or whatever else it may be called. In Scotland, the Presbyterian bodies, whether the Established or the Free Kirk, though they do not together amount to more than one of our larger dioceses, have each its General Assembly, which sits in what (as I am speaking south of the Tweed) I may call the provincial city of Edinburgh. Why should not the Church of England have something of the same kind? [MR. NAPIER: "And the Church of Ireland!"] I thank my right hon. friend. I believe there is one diocese of Ireland, of which I see the Bishop sitting behind me (Down and Connor), which has actually taken up Synodical organization. Look at the various matters which distract us at the present day—look at the Church, as the teacher and consoler of the people—look at her as the instrument by which men are everywhere to be taught to lift up holy hands and to sing the praises of their God. Ought not the diocese to be the centre of activity? Every diocese, I suppose, has its church building society and its education society. Many dioceses have also their penitentiary associations and various other organizations, which good men and true are working, but still which are liable to fall into the hands of a committee, perhaps of a clique, or of a secretary who has private communications with the Palace. I would say, "Don't dissolve these societies, but make each return members to some central body." I was taken to task three years ago at Manchester by an excellent friend, who is not at this Congress, because I advocated the representation of orders at these Diocesan Synods. That was said to be a most Radical suggestion. I assert, however, not only that it was not, but that it was directly the contrary. I did not want a representation of numbers, but I wanted a representation of interests—educational, penitentiary, disciplinary, architectural, ritual. I would have every possible power and function of the Church represented at the central body by those who, whether clergymen or laymen, are best acquainted with the subject. You may say that this is not strictly speaking a Synod. I don't say it is. What I want is corporate action. I don't discuss the question of the representation of the clergy; for if that is necessary it is the strongest possible argument for the absolute indispensability of a greater number of dioceses. I suppose we must assume that in such an assembly as I am speaking of every clergyman must be weighted by one layman. Well, then, take a diocese with which I am connected, Lichfield. In that diocese there are about 800 clergymen, and they would therefore have to be weighted by 800 laymen. But if you had an assembly of 1,600 persons at Lichfield, it would not be a deliberative body. It might be a Church Congress at Lichfield, but it would not be a Church assembly. The Prolocutor of Canterbury has argued with great zeal and learning against the admission of laymen into Convocation. I have no difference with him. I see my way almost as little to placing laymen in the Lower House as in the Upper. But could there not be some third house, which might sit in a room of its own, whether or not it were admitted to joint conferences with the Lower House upon its request, which might upon a certain range of questions—such for instance as would be referred to it—deliberate under regulations, and might act at all events as a co-ordinate committee of laity? I think that something of this kind might be attained; and that it would enable us to meet difficulties that may otherwise in future years produce disastrous results in the Church, and may create suspicion and division where there should be nothing but amity and love. Suppose we had had such an arrangement, how differently we might have dealt with a question which was before Parliament last session, as it will be before it next—that of Church-

rates ! There were eminent statesmen and excellent friends of the Church on both sides of the house, working hard to solve that question ; my excellent and learned friend, now in this hall, then the Attorney-General (Sir R. Palmer,) among the number. Another friend, the present Solicitor-General, (Chief Justice Bovill,) too, had a bill on the subject framed in a different key ; but we were all in a maze. We all wished to solve the question equitably to the Dissenters, but also equitably, rightly, and generously to the Church. But how were we to get at the Church's opinion ? We had to write plenty of letters by the penny post, and we had plenty of replies ; but we got a most unequal, unfair, and incomplete representation of the Church's feeling on the subject. Some wished to have one bill ; some desired another ; and others wanted no bill at all. But if we had had such an assembly as I have sketched out, in which the intelligence of the clergy and the intelligence of the laity might have been brought together, some outsiders might have been pleased with what it wanted, and some might have been displeased with it ; but at all events we could have said on the floor of the House of Commons, to Churchmen and Dissenters "Such is the opinion of the Church of England, and such is the measure that will content her." The present perplexity is an argument irrefragable to prove that the Church of England—her clergy and her laity—should have special and formal representation of opinion within herself and for herself, and if constituted by dioceses, so much the better.

The CHAIRMAN : I am sorry to say that I have here a very long list of the names of voluntary speakers, scarcely any of whom can be heard. Under these circumstances, I shall only be expressing the feelings of this Section when I call upon one who is not upon the list. We have amongst us the Bishop of Illinois, and I think we might exercise a form of hospitality towards him if we invited him to state to this meeting any facts that may have come within his knowledge as to the working of Synodical action in the American Church.

The BISHOP OF ILLINOIS : I presume that thus called upon I ought to feel no confusion in answering as to a simple matter of fact, and that fact one that has been interwoven so closely with all my experience of Ecclesiastical affairs, and is so closely bound up with the thorough conviction of my judgment and the deep interest of my heart. At the same time I do feel overwhelmed with confusion in venturing to say anything in connexion with a question so vital, and yet so complicated in relation to the Church of England, and I fear I shall do very inadequate justice to that system which we have so long tried in America, and respecting which I think I only express the sentiment of the American Church at large when I say that next to the institution authorised by God himself in the orders of the ministry, the last thing we should think of abandoning or changing, would be the synodical action of the laity in conjunction with the clergy in the administration of the Church. It has been my privilege to travel over a large portion of the continent of Europe ; and I have been struck, in connexion with the Church of God and the interests of religion, with various things that I have witnessed in that tour ; but amongst many instances of interest and gratification, there is one that has forced itself strongly upon my mind ; namely, that the American Episcopal Church is set forth before the whole body of Christians as developing and testing a question of great permanent interest to the whole Church ; and that whether we have judged rightly, or whether we have judged wrongly—whether we have succeeded or whether we have not succeeded,—there is nowhere in connexion with the Church of Christ, a more respected body than the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States of America. In God's providence we were severed from our beloved mother in England by the political changes which took place at the Revolution, and we were placed in circumstances of entire freedom in relation to the polity and administration of our Church. There were many circumstances in the principles of civil liberty which then prevailed that could not but enter into the organization, administration, and polity of the Church. These questions were freely and fully discussed, and there resulted the very closest resemblance between the principles entering into the polity of the Church and controlling its administration and those of the Government of the United States itself. There is in fact a most remarkable resemblance between the two. Without anything that was in the least degree forced, but only from the natural current of events in the development of essential principles, it is our proud boast, that all the great principles of our Government, the character and even the forms essential to its administration, have been successfully carried into the Church, and have thus far worked most successfully for its progress and its honour. However, I will on this occasion speak of but one principle in relation to the great matter before you, Diocesan Synods, or as

we call them, Annual Conventions. I can scarcely perhaps give an adequate idea of the real influence of Diocesan Synods, for you will be kind enough to take it into your recollection, that they are only a part of a great system. We have also our General Convention in connexion with our Annual Conventions to complete certain relations, and to act as a controlling power in certain things over those lower assemblies. The great point upon which, I understand, information is required is in regard to the representative constitution of these assemblies, and to the arrangements of the churches in our dioceses—which churches are in reality separate congregations, although we call them by the name of parishes. There are three distinct steps in their origination and organization. By the canons of our dioceses—I speak with some special reservations, as every thing with us is voluntary—whenever a body of Churchmen desire to organize a church, they address themselves to the Bishop. They state to him the distinct circumstances under which that organization is desired, and they ask his approval and his permission to proceed in the matter. This approval is entirely discretionary in the Bishop. If his permission is refused the matter stops. With his permission, the next step is to proceed to the local organization. For this we have in our separate States a general law, and there is no necessity to apply for any special act of the legislature to constitute a corporation in the eye of the law. There is a general law under the title of the Religious Corporations Act; and by obedience to this law this body of men of whom I am speaking can become a legal corporation, capable of suing and being sued, of holding property, and of administering the respective trusts that gather round the holding. The third step now comes. If they have placed themselves in a state of strict obedience and relation to the Diocese, and if they have constituted themselves a legal corporation, the third step is to effect their connexion with the Annual Convention. This is to a certain degree discretionary with the parish. A parish might not have any connexion with the Convention and yet it would still remain under the Bishop, and would be entirely and completely within his jurisdiction, just as if it had become a definite part of the Diocesan Synod. But suppose it proceeds to the third step it makes application under the Canons. Certain preliminary notices are given, and the papers relating to its organization are referred to a standing committee of the Convention, in order to determine whether everything has been correctly done. The committee having reported favourably, the parish by an act of union is joined to the Synod. The character of the relations between the respective parishes and their Annual Convention is of course two-fold—one is the relation of the clergy to the diocese, and the other their relation to the laity in the parishes themselves. Not every clergyman belonging to the diocese is entitled to a seat in the Convention; but our Canons define what shall constitute the qualification. This varies a little in different dioceses; but the general rule is that everyone shall possess a seat who is connected with the diocese as a settled minister or as assistant minister—for we have no curates and do not allow the term. In some dioceses the franchise is extended to aged and infirm clergymen, who have been active in the diocese, and it is also extended as a privilege to other clergymen—to missionaries of the diocese and to missionaries appointed by the Bishop. All these clergymen have seats in the Convention *ex virtute officii*; but every parish is likewise entitled to be represented by four laymen who are called Lay delegates. They are elected by the vestry or the congregation; and they come as a body to represent the parish, but they have only one vote in consequence of that representation. In the deliberations of the Annual Convention, the two orders sit unitedly; they sit together and have no specific seats. The clergy sometimes take their places with their own lay delegates, and sometimes they sit apart by themselves. In ordinary *viva voce* voting the votes are taken without reference to orders, but on questions that are very material, the vote, on the call of three voters, must be taken by orders. When it is so taken, the clergy vote first and the laity after them. Every parish is entitled to one vote; and if the parish is divided the vote is lost. There is a provision that on certain questions, there shall be a concurrence of two-thirds of each order to pass a resolution; but on general questions a majority of each order is sufficient. With regard to the matter and character of the debate, it is open indiscriminately to the clergy and the laity. We know no difference whatever between the orders in this matter. A speaker rises in his place and, at his desire, addresses the house under the ordinary rules that prevail in deliberative assemblies. The representation of the laity in our Annual Conventions forms however but a small portion of their real relations to the administration of the Church. With one single exception, and that an exception which belongs to the whole character and condition of the Catholic Church of Christ,—namely that a clergyman shall always be tried by his spiritual peers,—the laity, by the rules of

the American Church, have an equal and co-ordinate authority with the clergy themselves. From the election of the Bishop downwards through every portion of its administration, it is as emphatically true as language can make it, that there is no public act of the Church, no single condition in the exercise of its authority, not excepting even the admission of a candidate to Holy Orders, or the election of a Bishop, where the administration of the laity in the American Church is not co-ordinate with that of the clergy. Therefore the question of lay relations to the Church of Christ has been tried in America for three-quarters of a century; and I venture to say that with all the difficulties that may be supposed to exist in such a state of things—difficulties incident to human nature, to deliberative bodies, and to corporate action everywhere have been met. I venture to repeat that it would be impossible to find a respectable body in the American Church who would be willing to see any reduction, much less the entire abrogation of the concurrence of the laity with the clergy in the American Church.

His Grace the PRESIDENT pronounced the Benediction.

CONCERT ROOM. THURSDAY MORNING.

The Right Hon. the LORD MAYOR OF YORK in the Chair.

THE BEST MODE OF ATTACHING THE PEOPLE TO THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

THE DEAN OF CARLISLE READ THE FOLLOWING PAPER:—

It was the advice of one skilled in the instruction of young students in the art of making sermons, "Be sure you understand the text yourself." Advice not inopportune on the present occasion. If by the term, "The People," in our Thesis, we are to understand "Church people," or persons already within the influence of Church instruction, our thoughts would flow in a comparatively narrow channel; but if by "The People," the teeming population of this land are intended, a very different subject invites our consideration.

"The People," in this sense do not belong to us,—are not under our influence; vast masses of them are beyond the reach of our ordinances, are indifferent not merely to the claims of our Church, but to those of any Church: they must be ATTRACTED before they can be ATTACHED—they must be sought and found; they must be reclaimed as lost sheep before they can profit by the Shepherd's care. And with this view their physical, moral, social, and religious condition must be carefully examined. They must not be all placed in one category. The population of our towns differ widely from those of our country villages; even the inhabitants of different cities are not alike; almost every parish has its own idiosyncrasy; and if we would apply to each its appropriate remedy, the salient points of each must be considered.

Over a large portion of the whole of this alienated population, the Christian's eye must weep! "Rivers of waters run down mine eyes, because they keep not Thy law." (Ps. cxix., 136.) Hundreds of

men and women in this Christian land are sunk in the lowest depths of profligacy. Reliable statistics reported, not long since, that there are 100,000 persons in the Metropolis always in a state of intoxication, 150,000 habitual gin-drinkers, 100,000 open Sabbath-breakers, besides many who are guilty of other notorious and revolting crimes. What a mass of guilt and misery, humanly speaking almost irreclaimable, is thus presented to us !

But all are not found in this deplorable condition. Not a few of those who are known habitually to neglect the means of grace are not abandoned and profligate. Among such as are apparently devoid of all religious principle and feeling, many traits of character are displayed for which due credit should be given, and which should not be overlooked by those religious persons who would benefit them.

The working classes present many strange anomalies to those best acquainted with them. When little expected, not merely thrift, industry, sobriety, and self-dependence are found, but the exercise of some of the most genial and amiable of the social qualities. Nor are there wanting examples of self-denying benevolence to neighbours ; sometimes to strangers, orphans, and widows, which would do honour to any grade of society—and this without any apparent religious feeling or principle. If there is a fearful amount of rampant evil to be deplored among these people, there is not a little dormant good to be aroused. There is an increasing antipathy to infidelity and profaneness to be discerned among the masses : lecturers on such topics, once popular, now dare hardly show their faces ; anyone who publicly attacks the Clergy no longer meets with a favourable reception ;—there is an increasing respect for religion and its officers, more especially for those of our Church. A large acquaintance with the habits of thought among people of this rank of life justifies the assertion that there is a growing preference among them for the ministrations of the Church of England, particularly for her educated clergy ; the favorite theory that laymen or scripture readers, or men of inferior caste and education, find a more ready access to the homes of mechanics than the Clergy, is a mistake and a delusion. The bible-man or woman and the scripture reader, if truly pious, and judicious, and when under the direction of the parochial clergyman, is one whose religious labours are welcome, and truly valuable : but to assert, as some do, that they are more useful than the ordained Ministers of Christ, is alike contrary to fact and derogatory to a divine ordinance of the gospel. The truth is that working men of every class recognize and value the educated Christian gentleman ; and for this reason they prefer the clergy of the Church to all others when they are truly pious, spiritual, and faithful. They are jealous of those teachers who are only a little elevated above themselves, men who are afraid of too much familiarity with them, and hesitate to grasp the rough hand of the honest labourer lest they should lose caste. There cannot be a greater mistake than lowering the educational standard of our religious instructors.

The benevolent mind dwells with pleasure on such redeeming qualities as may be found even amongst persons who seem to be little affected by the influences of true religion. These things must be regarded only as the wild and luxuriant growth of uncultivated nature,

or perhaps as the secondary effects of a prevalent Christianity; still they indicate the fertility of the soil and the abundant harvest which might be gathered could but the Gospel plough be thrust into this wilderness, and the seeds of divine truth scattered over it; this wilderness might become "the garden of the Lord," it might soon "bud and blossom as the rose." Surely these wild lands invite our cultivation and would richly repay it.

But however promising these fields of labour may be, the sad truth must not be evaded, that at the present moment they are not cultivated. As things now are in many populous parishes there are hundreds of working men who are wholly strangers to the pastor, who never see him from one year's end to another, whom no religious influence even touches. The parochial clergyman is generally familiar with the wives and children—of the full-tongued beggar class he knows too much—the upper and wealthier classes are his familiars—the middle classes may be divided between Church and Dissent—but of that most advancing, influential, and imposing denomination, the well-to-do Industrials and Mechanics, he knows absolutely nothing; they belong to no one—none care for their souls—not from indifference or wilful neglect, but from the apparently insuperable difficulty of approaching them.

This is not the occasion for investigating the causes which have produced this lamentable state of things; nor is it practically important to distribute aright the blame which attaches itself to different public bodies or individuals; but it is of paramount importance that we should search for and consider the appropriate remedies; and how we can best overtake the progress of a redundant population, which appears to demand at our hands new and unprecedented efforts. In fact it is the question of our Thesis, as viewed from this point, how shall "these banished ones" be brought back—these lost ones be reclaimed,—these wanderers be restored to the Church of God? To this question one only answer can be given:—GOD'S HOLY WORD AND ORDINANCES! The proclamation of that Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is the Power of God unto Salvation, and the faithful administration of those Holy Sacraments which Christ Himself hath ordained for the comfort of his Church until He comes again. Nothing less than these can reclaim the lost, or restore them to the Church of God.

But again the previous question confronts us—How are these only efficacious remedies to be applied to these wanderers? Here are the sick men—and there are the remedies; but there is a great gulph between them: how are they to be brought together? What is "the best mode" of accomplishing this great object?

The PAROCHIAL SYSTEM is that expressly provided by our Church for this purpose. But it is the fashion in many quarters to run down this good old system, to proclaim its deficiencies and shortcomings, and to subsidise it by antient novelties which are to regenerate the land. Yet this system has never failed but for one of two causes; either the inefficiency and unworthiness of the person who has directed it, or from loading it with an amount of work beyond its powers. Any machinery however admirably constructed, would break down under similar pressure.

Is it not then our wisdom to reduce the amount of labour to the capacity of the engine, rather than to have recourse to other machinery which can never work in harmony with it?

The startling assertion appears in a work which was laid on the table of the Upper House of Convocation by the Lord Bishop of Oxford—"That the only way to reclaim the pious Dissenter, is the teaching and the example of the travelling friar."¹ And that if we would recover the lost masses, we must do as the mediæval Church did—"She founded religious orders, and north, south, east, and west flew the bare-footed, serge-frocked champions of orthodoxy."² The same authority counsels the extended establishment of fraternities and sisterhoods, convents and monasteries, "as the best organization for parish work."

It may be hoped that neither the country at large, nor "that pure and reformed part of Christ's Holy Catholic Church established in these realms," are prepared to adopt such measures as these for the reformation of the people. Voluntary associations of this character, altogether apart from their ill-omened similarity to the conventual system of the Church of Rome, abolished in this country by common consent at the Reformation, must interfere with, and in many cases supersede, the parochial system. Gregarious, unsocial, boastfully independent of episcopal control, connected in no visible, tangible, or legal manner, with the Ecclesiastical system of our Church, self-constituted and self-organized they would soon be the hot-beds of division, schism, and fanaticism—a clog and hindrance to the sober working of our Ecclesiastical machinery—if not, as some experiments on a small scale already portend—a scandal to the Church, and a laughing stock to the world!

The great desideratum is the multiplication of pious, devoted, self-denying, godly men in the parochial work of the ministry;—men who would blush to be suspected of assuming the sacred office for filthy lucre's sake;—men who are not moved by the prospect of Ecclesiastical honours, emolument and dignity, to put their hand to this work; they need not be celibates, much less serge-frocked monks or friars, but they must be men of God, full of love to Christ and of zeal for His glory;—send such men forth;—and why not? They are few and difficult to obtain! But is there not a boundless, a divine supply? The want is not new, nor is the supply exhausted.—"The harvest truly is plenteous, but the labourers are few. Pray ye, therefore, the Lord of the harvest, that he will send forth labourers into his harvest." (Matt. ix., 37, 38.)

But the question again returns upon us. Suppose the labourers multiplied, and parishes reduced to reasonable and practicable limits, how shall we attract the wanderer?

We must leave the deep ruts of long custom, and strike out new tracks across these wilds! These people will not come to us, we must go to them. This is not unnatural; the shepherd must seek the sheep, and not the sheep the shepherd.

Now, many schemes, and some not exclusively of a spiritual character, have been adopted, and with varied success for this object. We have high authority for direct religious instruction in other than

(1) "*The Church and the World*," p. 101.

(2) *Ibid*, p. 26.

our ordinary and appointed channels. Bishops now preach at railway stations, in stable yards to cabmen and omnibus men, on the shore to fishermen, at the mouth of mines to colliers;—if ever it were a necessity to proclaim the truths of the Gospel “in season and out of season,” anywhere and everywhere, surely it is so now. But is it lawful, is it wise, for the Clergy to proceed further, and to enter on the neutral ground of science, literature, and the fine arts, or even to venture into the circle of amusements of a moral and correct character, with the view of making acquaintance with the people, to gain their good will, and so to draw them to the Church and the means of Grace?

These are difficult and delicate questions, the replies to which must be greatly modified by the different circumstances of our cures, and by the special qualifications of the Clergy themselves. In every case the utmost wisdom and discretion are needed, and the exercise of a sound and mature judgment.

In cities and among people, to a certain extent educated and well informed, popular lectures, on subjects partly scientific and partly religious, have been found eminently useful. Men of that class will attend such lectures in a town hall, or public assembly room, who have never been attracted to Church; but finding their parson full of useful and interesting information on the common topics of the day, and on subjects which are familiar to their minds, while, without assuming the character of a preacher, he sprinkles his lectures with such appropriate observations as indicate his pious object; they naturally learn to esteem his disinterested labours for their good, and thus are drawn to the House of God.

“POPULAR PENNY READINGS,” as they are termed, bear a more questionable character, too often partaking of the nature of mere amusement; and unless very wisely and cleverly managed by the presiding clergyman degenerate into levity.

Out-of-doors country village sports require also to be very much restrained and governed with a sharp curb, or they, too, are liable to great abuse. They should not be hastily condemned; cricket, foot-ball, quoits, skittles, and similar games of activity and skill, often form an excellent substitute for those provided by the publican as an attraction to his customers, and may be judiciously encouraged. But whether it suits the dignity and gravity of the ministerial office, for the clergyman himself personally to mingle with these sports is very doubtful. When his people meet him on the following Sunday in the House of God, it cannot promote their respect or reverence for his office or his work, to remember that he was bowled out at cricket by the Parish Clerk, or suffered at foot-ball from the hob-nailed shoes of one of his humbler parishioners.

All these exoteric and secular means of gaining an influence over the more thoughtless of our people need to be watched with vigilance, and handled discreetly. It certainly did not occur to the writer of this paper that it could be necessary to guard himself against the possibility of being misunderstood on this part of his subject: but circumstances have occurred during the session of this Congress which compel him to enter his most solemn protest against the desecration of the Sabbath-day by village sports.

It is difficult to understand the nature of that piety which craves a weekly administration of the Lord's Supper, and the supplementary cricket match; or with what consistency we can denounce Sabbath desecration in high places, when the rustics are to be taught that the boisterous mirth of village games is a becoming conclusion to the Church service! One *can* understand why in such cases some gentlemen should wish the sermon to be omitted.

But there is one mode of ATTRACTING and ATTACHING the people to the Church and her ordinances, which has never failed of extended success wherever it has been prudently and perseveringly adopted; and its power of influencing the great mass of the working classes has often surprised even its warmest advocates. There is among these people, and even among those who are themselves intemperate, a deep seated respect and affection for those pastors who, simply with a view of benefitting others by an example of voluntary self-denial, deprive themselves of that which they believe to be a lawful, or even beneficial indulgence. The names of 598 clergymen of our Church are now published, who have adopted the practice and profession of total abstinence from all intoxicating liquor. This measure has awakened so strong a feeling of sympathy and gratitude among their parishioners that, in not a few instances, many persons have been attracted to the ordinances of religion who before totally neglected them. Indeed, so strong is the hold which this subject has on the working classes, and especially on those who are exposed to the temptation of the gin palace and beer house, that they are ready to follow any minister who will lead them by this route to the worship of God. At all events it cannot be denied that this is one lawful and powerful method of attracting the people to the "Ministry of the Word."

Whether the principle and practice of total abstinence from all intoxicating drinks will produce any widely extended or permanent effects, as long as the present licensing system continues, may be doubted: the temptations thrown in the way of the working classes by the laws of the land, prove too strong for them. The startling fact that there are in London itself eleven public houses or spirit shops, for one Temple of God—taking into the calculation all Protestant churches and chapels—ought to awaken anxious enquiry on the subject of further legislative restraint. If the famous Permissive Bill be objected to, those who dissent from that measure should find some substitute for it, some adequate correction for so great an evil.

One other mode of reaching the hearts of the alienated classes, remains to be noticed, and one about which there should be no difference of opinion, for it is stamped with the impress of a Divine sanction;—it may be comprehended in one word—**PHILANTHROPY.**

There is a morbid jealousy in the minds of some excellent persons on this subject. They fear lest the Clergy or any who are prominently engaged in conveying spiritual instruction should, by too much attention to the temporal necessities of the people, lay themselves open to the suspicion of bribing them to become religious, thus perhaps promoting hypocrisy. They would altogether separate temporal relief from spiritual instruction.

Our answer to such scruples is the example of our Blessed Lord Himself. He generally prefaced, and almost always accompanied, his

spiritual instruction with acts of mercy and benevolence. When challenged for evidence of the truth of his mission He ever appealed to his miracles of mercy performed on the bodies of men, no less than to the great criterion, "that to the poor the gospel was preached." This course of conduct was the result of a profound and perfect knowledge of our fallen humanity. "He knew what was in man;" He knew that men incapable of appreciating a spiritual doctrine were easily moved by acts of kindness, regard for their temporal trials, and disinterested efforts for their relief.

In a cold, calculating world, men, especially irreligious men, are hard to believe in real disinterestedness, and they look on the Clergy as hirelings who are well paid for their work; but when they find us travelling out of our prescribed duties, taking an active part in improving their dwellings, bettering their condition, and by education and intellectual culture raising their position socially, they not seldom begin to lend a willing ear to what we have to say on more important spiritual subjects.

In a word, these people have hearts which can appreciate those works of faith which proceed of love:—won by these—the fair fruits of genuine principle—they may be brought within the range of those "Means of Grace," which shall at length convey even to them, now so far off—"the hopes of glory!"

MR. ERSKINE CLARKE THEN READ THE FOLLOWING PAPER:—

I feel bound, from regard to the reputation of one whose memory is dear to all English Churchmen, to sacrifice a minute or two * of those allowed me to make another reference to the matter of Sunday cricket playing. I was told yesterday by one who had it direct from Mr. Peter Young, who was at the time curate to Mr. Keble, that the origin of the cricket playing referred to was this. Sunday cricket playing in the neighbourhood of Hursley was then most lawless in character, and Mr. Keble, instead of denouncing it, and driving the young men and lads from him, endeavoured to adopt means to keep it in order. He therefore gave it a certain limited sanction, of which he said at the time that he hoped it might never be misrepresented as applying to the question of Sabbath observance.

I TAKE it that our subject is meant to refer chiefly to "the people" as they exist in masses in our towns and cities, rather than as they are met with in villages and country districts; and as such experience as I have has been acquired in towns, I have written my paper chiefly with this scope.

I propose to touch upon a few agencies *outside* the fabric of the Church, and then on some *within* it, whereby I think we may do something to attach the people to the Church of England.

Of agencies *external* to the sacred fabric; first of all I would mention the self-evident one of house-to-house visitation, though therein I condemn myself, for I must own to being a very imperfect parish priest in this respect. The old saying is true that "a house-going parson makes a church-going people," but I fear that many town clergy, in the multiplicity of other works which are thrust upon us, discharge but fitfully this very bounden duty. It is plain that house-to-house work, in districts where the people are massed together, is far more difficult, and far less pleasant, than "house-to-house work" in rural lanes or in the village street; but I am sure if it be of the *right* sort and done in the *right* spirit, it will be found one most sure and effectual agency for attaching the people to the Church. But it *must* be of the *right* sort; not inquisitorial, not patronising, not condemnatory, not even, I venture to say, always directly hortatory; but it must be hearty, sympathising, respectful, offering the service of a *friend*, not of the *relieving officer*; having an eye for the children, and seeking for something to commend rather than to blame; dropping a few words of good cheer over the often embittered and reckless lives of these poor folk—words which will have all the more effect, because they will check those to whom they are spoken from hardening their hearts against the reproof, which the mere presence of a religious visitor conveys to the conscience even of the careless and abandoned.

But, beside the interest in the *individual*, which is manifested in the visitation of the home of the neglectful by the clergy, the lay agent, the Deaconess, the Sister, or the mission-woman,—those who are anxious to attach the people to the Church will endeavour also to influence them in more *public* ways, and to this end strive to show their interest in whatever is for their welfare. Anything that shows the parson to be in sympathy with the people, in their temptations or in their necessities, will help on the work of evangelising. And this is how Total Abstinence seems to me to be valuable. Every one who knows anything about the state of our towns admits that drink and drinking-places are the most formidable hindrances to our efforts. Those who know most of the habits and customs of working folk affirm that moderation in the use of stimulants is almost an impossibility with them—at least in the airless, crowded, unwholesome dwellings of the lowest strata of society. If you are to *attach* the masses of the very poor to the Church you must *detach* them from the drink; and therefore I am persuaded that a Total Abstinence society, put on reasonable principles, is an agency which we are not wise in leaving to the Dissenter or the Secularist. It is not indispensable that the clergyman should absolutely abstain, if he gives his active co-operation to those who do; but if he can use this practical (perhaps I may admit this unreasonable) self-denial for his brethren's sake, he will find that it gives him power for good, and he will be doing something to dissipate that prevalent idea amongst working people that the clergy are a self-indulgent body who are well paid out of the taxes, for doing what Primitive Methodists and local preachers do for nothing.

And while the parson shows his sympathy with the *temptations* of the very poor, in trying to shield them from drink, I think he will do well to show his sympathy also with their *necessities* by caring in

some way for their recreation. At present in our towns the amusements of the poor are provided by those who have a direct interest in demoralizing them; and so the recreation, which is an absolute necessity to the over-worked tenants of the poor folks' quarter in our towns, leads directly to their debasement, and to their estrangement, not only from the Church, but from all religious influences. It is by no means easy to provide anything that can even feebly compete with the glare of the tavern, or the attractions of the music-hall, or the low theatre. But something may be done, at least to keep the younger folk from running into these scenes of temptation. I have now for seven or eight years made my Sunday in the winter months to begin, I might say, on the Saturday night, and have had provided by my lay-helpers, under my own direction, simple entertainments of music, singing, and readings, which have kept hundreds of young folk away from the allurements of vicious public entertainments, and have been the first link in the chain that now attaches not a few working men to my congregations: for, seeing that I had a care for them in a way which they could understand and appreciate, they thought that I might be able to benefit them in the way which hitherto they had neglected or despised.

I think, then, that if we can compass the provision of some bright, cheerful, innocent entertainment for Saturday night, eschewing, however, the *comic* as distinguished from the *humorous*, we shall detach many from that bondage which holds them in degradation, and bring them within the reach of those influences which may, by God's grace, attach them to the Church.

Another agency outside of the sacred walls, whereby the people should be attached to the Church, but are not save in exceptional cases, is the Sunday School. It seems to be admitted very generally that there is some fault and weakness about Sunday Schools as commonly constituted. They ought to have proved the *nurseries* of our Churches, but they have not. There are numberless cases in which, while the Sunday School has been crowded even for a dozen years under one and the same able ministry, the old church has not been enlarged, nor any new church built for the district.

And so we can scarcely wonder at a curious and suggestive statement which has been drawn from the last Religious Census, though we may explain it away by different local circumstances,—this statement, that Bristol, for instance, and other towns give the *lowest* percentage attending Sunday Schools and the *highest* per-centage of worshippers. In fourteen towns with from 13 to 20 per cent. of Sunday Scholars, there were but 19 per cent. of worshippers, while in a similar number of towns showing only 12 per cent. of scholars, the per-centage of worshippers was 25.

These figures go to strengthen the belief that Sunday Schools fail in a notable degree to educate children in attachment to the Church. The truth is, that the Sunday School has been held in most undue estimation in our parochial machinery. It has led to our ignoring the parental responsibility, and taking out of the parents' hands the duty of training their children, and delegating this to our Sunday School teachers, whose self-denying labours have borne most inadequate results from the disadvantage at which they were thus placed in relation to the children.

Though I trench on another subject in saying it, yet I must affirm my conviction that since the vast majority of the children of the poor pass through Day, Ragged or Sunday schools, of which we clergy are managers, we are verily to blame in letting so sadly many of these children sink back into the irreligion and estrangement which we deplore.

A reform, almost a revolution, seems needed in our Sunday Schools. Some points of which reform should be, that we should aim at *ripening character* rather than merely *imparting knowledge*—that we should make the time of teaching short, and its character dogmatic and definite—that we should abjure the practise of *penning* the children together in church, or setting them as a restless fringe on the outskirts of the congregation or in the aisles.

When we remember what example the parents of these children set them, what *they* are doing while these children are undergoing this long punishment in the name of religion, I can conceive no way in which we can more effectively *detach* them from the Church, and make future attachment almost impossible, than this compulsory attendance at services beyond their comprehension. I speak of *town* children, not of country children; and I say that though the *girls* may not be estranged by this process, the lads almost invariably are. I have found the plan of having a short service in church for children *before the Sunday School* to answer well for three or four years; and my own difficulty is not that I lose my elder scholars, but that I cannot get rid of them; and it is they who have very mainly so crowded my church, that since last Congress we have had a new church consecrated, in which there are now well nigh a thousand worshippers every Sunday night, and yet the parent hive is as full filled as ever. And from this rather egotistical illustration, for which however I desire to give all glory and praise to God, I pass to some of those matters *within* the sacred walls which may help to attach the people to the Church.

And first, though there are differences of opinion as to the "free and open" principle of church seats in small populations and in country places, there can be none surely where a church is intended to attract to itself the lowest of the lapsed and ignorant classes. Poor folk who can hardly keep body and soul together by reason of their poverty, or of their enslavement to drink, are not likely to claim from the churchwardens the assignment of a seat to themselves, still less to make a quarterly payment in advance for a narrow and straight-backed deal compartment, in a church that opens its doors only on Sunday morning and afternoon! But they can thoroughly understand the invitation that says, "You are welcome to take the best seat that you see vacant, and there's nothing to pay."

I need scarcely say that, in a church that is intended to do missionary work, there should be no table of fees in the vestry. The offering for such special service as churchings or weddings would then be left to the prompting of hearts grateful even in their poverty, and not enforced according to the "list of prices" which is the parish clerk's delight, but which I for one would be glad to see subject to the same eclipse which is now happily obscuring that generally too prominent official.

We all know that the incomes of clergy, especially in large and poor districts, are small enough, but "*fees*" form no appreciable item

in that income, while the miserable suspicion and belief that we cannot say a few prayers without being paid for it, is a serious hindrance to Church work amongst the masses.

It is distressing to find the woman's "accustomed offering" oftentimes changed into a shilling fee to the clerk and parson; it is more than distressing to find that a 6d. fee for baptisms (nominally for registration) is charged in many populous districts; while it is stated, though I can hardly believe it, that at St. George's, Hanover Square, in London, a prohibitory tax of 5s. is charged on registration of baptisms, which are thus discouraged amongst the poor, in violation of all Ecclesiastical law. The railway works attract to Derby great numbers of work-people who come from many different districts, and we find it almost impossible to persuade them that we baptize children without any payment.

In cases where the sacrament of Baptism is not thus illegally taxed, I presume that the fees for weddings would be the most productive; but if they were tenfold more productive than they are, surely the recent returns of the fearful increase of godless marriages at the register offices, would tempt us to abjure the fee, and to marry our people in Christian fashion for nothing.

But if poor and ignorant people are to be allured to use churches that are free and open to them, and that are even planted in their very midst, the sacred fabric itself must be made warm, bright, and attractive, and the hours and nature of the services must be arranged with regard to the habits and character of the neighbourhood.

If (as has been noted by a recent writer) it be worth the while of those who provide the gin palaces, for the most poverty-stricken and and wretched streets and alleys of our great towns, to spend enormous sums of money on internal decoration, abundant polished metal, on vivid colouring, and on plenty of bright light, so as to induce people to stay on drinking just because everything is so pretty and cheerful to the-eye,—and so unlike the squalid discomfort of their own homes!—moreover, if many such landlords have found even all this insufficient, without the additional attraction of music, and the low singing hall is sure to indicate the most thriving drinking shop in the worst quarters of our great towns;—if this be so—if painting, light, and music are found necessary adjuncts in a trade which has already enlisted on its side one of the strongest of human appetites, it is surely most unwise to reject their assistance when we are endeavouring to persuade men to accept, and voluntarily seek, an article for which they have never learnt to care, even if they are not actively hostile to it—to wit, religion.

I need not here complicate my subject by dwelling on the diversities of ritual which form the subject of existing controversy, for they appertain to that which is the highest expression of the devout and established Christian—rather than to the best mode of drawing in the hardened or the negligent. But few will dispute that we are more likely to attract and retain these needy occupants of miserable homes, by giving them, for the home of their souls, a church as bright and beautiful as we can make it—a service of song as hearty and vigorous as the congregation can be educated unto—a symbolism as rich, and a ritual as full, as is contemplated by the Offices of our Reformed Book of Common Prayer.

At the same time it appears that services in church can hardly be evangelistic ; unless indeed it be such an afternoon Choral Evensong for the school children (with a short sermon), as has been found in the grand Collegiate Church of Wolverhampton to be not only most useful to the children—interesting them in, and educating them for, the ordinary services,—but also has been found to attract many of their parents and other very poor persons. In respect of hours of service, manifestly a church that is to be a refuge for the weary sin-sick souls of those who are given over to desperation or the wretchedness of most unclean living—such a church must be *often*, if not *always*, open ! It must have day by day the appointed times at which the church bell rings, like the voice of God, over the adjacent courts and alleys, speaking of mercy and of pardon. At those times the people will know that they can meet their pastor, without having to go through the nervous ceremony of ringing his door-bell and sending a message through a servant—no trivial obstacles to those who are at once both proud and shy. Above all, at those hours the Clergyman, with perhaps but two or three gathered together, will minister daily in the priest's office before God, and pray for himself, his people, and his work !

It is scarcely within the scope of my subject to urge frequent celebrations of the Holy Communion ; but I am persuaded that *frequent Confirmations* are most valuable as evangelistic agencies. Confirmation is not only a most distinctive ordinance of our Church, the lack of which has been lamented by bodies who dissent from us, but also it has in it more of that element of spectacle which so much attracts the attention of all classes, but specially of the humbler ones. Moreover, the teaching given in the special preparation is carried into the homes of the candidates ; the very opposition and persecution, which it stirs up in workshops and street corners, serves to stimulate inquiry and to spread truth, albeit mixed with error and misrepresentation.

In every parish of any size there should be a Confirmation if possible in the Church of the parish every year. In our large towns, at least, there should be *annual*, and not as is still the case in very many dioceses, only *triennial* Confirmations ! and if in our manufacturing towns they are held on Sunday afternoon, they will be of still greater value.

Frequent Confirmations in large town parishes, I believe, will be found to lead to an increase in the number of candidates. My own Bishop, the Bishop of Lichfield, albeit advanced in years, has kindly given me two special annual Confirmations for my own congregation, supplementing the general triennial Confirmation for the town of Derby, and on the last Sunday of this month we hope to present a larger number of candidates than in the Confirmations of three preceding years.

Of course, frequent Confirmations involve more Bishops ; and perhaps those two words, "*more Bishops*," are the most exhaustive answer to the question, "What is the best mode of attaching people to the Church of England ?"

It would be a great additional gain if we had not only more Bishops, but *more* who were eloquent and able preachers, for it is by the preaching of the Word that souls are chiefly to learn the way of salvation.

I have observed in a religious movement, which has lately got hold for a time of some of the very lowest and most hardened of our poor in Derby, that the chief instruments used have been singing of hymns to popular and profane tunes, and very fervid, pointed, emotional preaching in the Market-place and in public halls. And it has appeared to some of us that it would have been an immense help to us, if we could have invited from a diocesan central school of preaching some one or two men who had cultivated this especial gift, and who could have opposed these false teachers with a like ready and vigorous eloquence.

I would venture to suggest, what has already been touched on in other sections of the Congress, that "Diocesan Preachers" might do much to gain the ear of the estranged or negligent masses of our populations. Though there are manifest practical difficulties, yet I think that some such idea as this might be worked into shape by actual trial. That the Bishop of such a diocese, for instance, as Lichfield should select, say three or four clergymen, who are not merely readers of good sermons, but real preachers, with qualifications physical and intellectual for handling large popular assemblies, and for dealing wisely and sympathisingly with individual cases of conscience, and also endued with tact and judgment in dealing with the beneficed clergy. Such a position, and if possible such an income, should be secured to these preachers that they should not be disquieted about preferment, and should be put on an equality at least with the town incumbents. It would be most helpful if such a preacher could come, say for a month in the year, to such a town as Derby, and preach either in the open air, or in some great public hall having a mission-room, to which at the end of each sermon he could invite his preachers for spiritual counsel, and either deal with their cases himself, or bring them under the notice of the parochial clergyman. Possibly also to this preaching-room there might be attached one or two Readers or Sub-deacons, who might carry on the work in the absence of the Diocesan Preacher. Chief among the dangers which would have to be avoided in any such scheme would be the *mis-use* of the preacher for tickling the ears of ordinary and settled congregations, or for preaching money-getting sermons for schools or other charities. And also there would be danger lest those gathered in by the Diocesan Preacher and his co-workers should form a local attachment to the preaching-room, and not pass on to the Parish Church—though perhaps even so they might form the nucleus of a new district.

Lastly, I would express my firm conviction, as others have done before me, that there is in this very time a blessed and hopeful work for any who desire, in their Master's name, to reclaim to the Church those who have fallen from her embrace, or to gather in those whom she has never taken in her arms. For, in spite of her own neglect and apathy in the past—in spite of existing organizations which set forth at first as handmaids to do the work she was leaving undone, but now, alas! are disposed to be rivals impeding the work she is striving to accomplish—in spite of the efforts of political adversaries to misrepresent her—in spite also of the feeble and faltering half-heartedness of many of our own doings, the love of the old English

Church lies deep in the hearts of the people of the land, and it must be our own fault if we do not, by God's grace assisting us, by degrees again attach them to her as their beloved and honoured mother.

DISCUSSION.

THE REV. R. GREGORY: In considering this question, everything depends upon the stand-point from which we view it; and before we can discover the measures necessary to attach people to the Church, we must know the position in which the people are. In London, for instance, they seem to be at a lower level than in the provinces, for there is a much smaller per-centage of the people who pay any attention to religion or attend church. The calculation is that not one in fifty of the working men on the south side of the Thames are found in any place of worship at all. The great question in that locality is how to lay hold of these men—how to begin with them. To think they can be gained simply by religious ordinances is a complete mistake. They do not seem to have the least desire to listen to any one who attempts to gain their attention in their houses; and to go forth and preach in the streets is useless, because it is found, as a rule, that such preaching does not attract any who will not listen to God's Word elsewhere. We must therefore start from some other point; and the first thing we must do is to find out where our ministrations in secular matters can be brought into contact with them, so as to convince them that we really sympathise with them. In my own parish we have a large number of skilled workmen—men that we scarcely ever come in contact with except they are lying on a bed of sickness. I have found no plan more appreciated by many of them than efforts made to impart to them some knowledge of art. They know that they can command better wages if their talents for drawing are cultivated; and seeing that we understand their wants, and their worldly interests are bettered by what the Church school of art does for them, some are attracted to church, and a few have become attached members of it. But we find there is another great difficulty in dealing with a great mass of poor. To give alms fails to attach them to the giver. The reception of alms degrades them in their own eyes; and although at the moment they are grateful to the donor, almsgiving in the long run fails to have the effect we are in the habit of attributing to it. How then can we assist the poor without direct almsgiving? is a question of great importance; but I am happy to say it is one which we have solved in a measure in Lambeth. Our solution is to find them work. It seems that for the clergy to become employers of labour is stepping out of their proper path, but that is really what we have become. A few winters ago there were great numbers of needlewomen out of work, who had no resource but parochial relief or the workhouse. We thought if we could find out some system whereby their wants might be provided for, and their self-respect maintained, we should do a great work, and might attach some to the Church. We found the means of employing the poor by becoming army contractors; and I am at this moment a large army contractor. This year I hope to deliver to the Government 100,000 shirts for the soldiers and sailors; and so keenly appreciated is the employment we give that we begin to find a difficulty in providing sufficient of it, and it is only this week that we have sent in a tender to supply shirts to the Italian Government. Of course, as we do not seek to make a profit out of the business, the seamstresses get much better wages for their work than under ordinary circumstances. By the instrumentality of this plan the people are made to recognise the truth of our statement that we are their friends, and only wish them well in asking them to come to church and to lead better lives. When they find that they get double the wages they used to get from the slop-sellers they know we are disinterested; people come to church who never came before, and thus we trust the Church is gradually winning her way amongst them. But secular occupations cannot be depended upon, and efforts of this kind are applicable only to exceptional cases. I mention my own experience in a large and populous poor parish as a hint which may prove useful elsewhere and in various ways. One of the weakest parts of the Church in this land is the fact that the laymen do not recognise themselves as living portions of the great body of Christ. The several veins and arteries of a human body are not placed within it for their own benefit, but to convey the living fluid to every part. If they were not to perform their functions they would harden and close;

and laymen too often isolate themselves from all their fellow-members of the Church with exactly the same result. We clergy cannot spread our personal labours beyond a certain point; but if our faithful communicants would do their part in the parish, more would be done, and it would be done in a better way than we can possibly do it. There are reasons which make our work in large towns increasingly difficult. There is, for instance, a greater separation of classes—the rich and poor are becoming more and more divided into different quarters. Again, the relations between masters and men are greatly altering—a change on which the clergy ought to keep an observant eye. There was a time when men worked a whole lifetime for the same master; now a man is engaged for the job. In the case of large building firms the work is contracted for, and the master has nothing to do with engaging the men. They are engaged by the foreman, and never come into contact with their employer at all. There are no bonds of love and respect between them. There is in my parish one of the old-fashioned employers, and I have known men give up a guinea a week elsewhere to take 18s. there. When I spoke to one of those men he said, “If I am ill or have an accident I do not have my wages stopped at the instant; and the ladies of the partners come and visit our families, and help them if they are in need.” The Church loses much by the disappearance of these personal bonds of interest between classes, and if the people are to be really attached to the Church something must be done to replace them. One of my poorer parishioners, a most respectable woman, told me the other day that she had for thirty years seen the same people pass to and from church, and no word of recognition had ever been exchanged until lately; when they had been brought together by some united effort of parochial work. There must be a living personal interest taken in each other by the different classes of society, if the people are to be really attached to the Church. Some way must be found in which they can meet, occasionally at least, and learn something of one another. I do not think it necessary that this sort of intercourse should be frequent. Once or twice in a year would perhaps be enough to bring them together; and when they met in the streets or in “the courts of the house of the Lord,” a nod and a smile or a word would naturally be interchanged, and something would be done towards uniting them together in the bonds of love. One great cause of the strength of Dissent in the middle classes is the fact that this principle of personal knowledge of, and interest in, each other is actively at work amongst them, and not amongst us. It is a common remark that Dissenters seem to know and love one another, and that Church people do not. Then there is the danger of being too respectable to mix amongst the poor and see to their wants and wishes, and you may depend upon it that the fine gentleman heresy runs through not only the clergy but the whole body of Church people. In looking at the history of the middle ages the same principle was at work with them as with us, in fulfilling such penances as were imposed upon them by their confessors; and we find amongst them pecuniary payments taking the place of religious duty. They believed they could not get to heaven without penances, but money payments were accepted in their place. Now we must all of us believe that our religion is of not much value if we are letting the poor starve at our doors; but we are very apt to do as they did in the middle ages, and think that a money payment discharges us of the responsibility of caring for the poor which Christ has laid upon His Church. If the Church of England is to be the Church of the people, this practice must be less prevalent. If those who give money would stretch out their arms and give it with their own hand, they would do infinitely more good; and the effect of giving in that way is marvellous. Some years ago the Society for the Relief of Distress sent a gentleman to assist us in relieving the poor in Lambeth. He was much struck with the amount of poverty, and out of his own pocket, as well as from the funds of the society, he gave us liberal help; before his lamented death he allowed nearly five pounds a week to invalids, and widows, and aged people in my parish. He used to come and see the recipients of his bounty himself, and his visits were like angel’s visits. The people felt there was an amount of love and sympathy in them, which made them forget their sorrows, and the remembrance of which lightened their daily load of grief. What this good man did, all earnest Christian men must do in their measure, if we are to attach the people to the Church. The upper classes in thus doing their duty, and showing sympathy with the poor, have their hearts quickened to a livelier sense of the reality of religion; the poor will be attracted by their sympathy to what is good in their example. Through such ministrations all will be attached to that church, those guiding hand through such deeds of love leads them to peace, and draws them nearer to their Saviour.

Mr. POWELL, M.P.: There is one primary and fundamental means of attaching the people to the Church, and this is by maintaining consistently and firmly, without

wavering, religious education. The great point to be aimed at in all our schools is the inculcation of a reasonable amount of Christian doctrine. At the present time there is far too great a tendency to expose the young men rising up amongst us to what may be described as a sort of theological "Judgment of Paris." Every possible phase of opinion, every possible phase of faith, are presented to them as equally good and true, and they are invited to make choice. It seems to me, on the contrary, that if we are to attach the people to the Church of England, we should plant within them sound religious principles, and thus fix in their hearts a sure foundation which will not vary, but on which a new light may be thrown as science becomes more exact, and knowledge more profound. I think it necessary to enunciate this principle now because the whole battle of secular education may again and before long have to be fought. It may be difficult to teach in school hours all that we wish to inculcate, but this principle should never be lost sight of. The next duty we have to discharge is to give the people a greater love for our cathedral system. Some years ago the question was raised, "What shall we do with our cathedrals?" Now we should, if challenged, unite in exclaiming, "What should we do without our cathedrals?" I am glad to say, in passing, that efforts are now making to restore to several of those ancient edifices, which have by lapse of ages been deprived of their naves, that important part of the building. This is being done at Bristol; and I have just been told by the Dean of Carlisle that he is exerting himself to have the nave restored to his cathedral. But efforts to make our cathedrals what they ought to be are only a branch of the great duty of multiplying Churches. It will be impossible to attach the people to the Church if there be not accommodation in the Churches for them. Open Churches and the multiplication of services might do something, but that will be found to be quite insufficient. The present annual increase of church accommodation is estimated at about 50,000, which is, happily, not an increase disproportioned to the ratio in which the population increases. It is a serious matter to see, in the neighbourhood of all large towns, the wealthy suburbs left almost entirely in the hands of Dissenters. The Church should be at work in the centre of a town amongst the poor—that is its place and its duty—but do not let us surrender to the Dissenting minister the wealthy inhabitants of the suburbs who ought to be the strength and support of the Church in her great work of evangelising the masses of the people. The men who live in these suburbs are the great growing middle classes of the country who are gathering to themselves more power and influence day by day. To use a common phrase, they never "let the grass grow under their feet,"—they are always moving on—they never rest contented with what they have, but are always struggling for something more. They are men who, if they attach themselves to any religious denomination, will not allow it to lag behind, but will carry it with them and keep it always in the front. They are the men who if not drawn from our Church ought to be and would be her earnest supporters and advocates in these new and wealthy suburban districts. The maxim of the Church should be "Work for every man and every man for his work." If the people were interested in the work of the Church they would, by a reflex action, soon become attached to her communion. I saw the other day in a foreign land a system in operation which seemed to me to be most valuable, and one that would be very useful to adopt at home. It was a society formed for the promotion of six works of Christian duty. Those who joined the society had a free choice as to which of the six they would attach themselves, but having made that choice, they were expected to devote themselves to that one object with earnestness and perseverance, with a due sense of responsibility, as having once taken in hand a complete and satisfactory execution of that work. I will not read the rules, they being numerous: but such a fact teaches us that there is good to be learnt from the organisations of other communions. No one will accuse the Dean of Carlisle of Romanising tendencies; but the very cause, respecting which he is so energetic, namely, the cause of temperance is taken up by the French Roman Catholic clergy.

THE DEAN OF CARLISLE: I am glad to hear it.

MR. POWELL: I have here an advertisement which I copied from a Church door in France respecting a society for total abstinence established under the guidance of the clergy of the parish. There is some doubt yet existing as to the system of appropriating seats; and the free and open Church system. It is a wicked, a wrong, and a sacrilegious thing to prevent in any Church the occupancy of a seat by a stranger. The whole Church is as it were the sacred territory of God; upon which it is an encroachment to appropriate any portion of the space to the private convenience of any individual. My time urges me and I cannot go further into that question than to remark that the pew system is a great hindrance to the work of attaching the masses of the people to the Church. Before I conclude I must say that I have often thought

our clerical friends do not enough attach themselves to, or assist in good works which are not specially and distinctively "Church" works—they will have the Church in all things or the Church in none. In many cases the visits of the clergyman as a coadjutor or adviser would be rejoiced in, when the predominance of the clerical element would be rejected; and the clergy lose many means and opportunities of influencing the people for good, because they cannot enjoy entire control. There are many other things, to which I cannot now allude under this severe pressure as to time, which might gain for the Church a deeper hold on the hearts of the people. Let every portion of the social system be permeated by these influences and the Church will gain more power for good year by year. And although it is impossible to hope that we can win back all those who are separated from us, there is one thing we may gain, and towards which we are advancing year by year, more and more, viz.: the unanimous attachment of all honest English hearts.

MR. CHARLES LONGUET HIGGINS, of Turvey Abbey, Bedfordshire. Almost the whole of the admirable remarks, both of those who have read papers and those who have spoken, have related to the large masses of the people who live in towns, the great centres of modern industry; but the important questions they have raised are also interesting to us who live in the country. It has been my lot for many years to be placed in the centre and heart of England, surrounded by an agricultural population and where the women are almost all employed in lace making. Remote as we are from towns, those great questions which agitate the Church from time to time make their way amongst us, and there is a great desire amongst even the poorest to know more about the Church of England. It has been said, and a belief seems to prevail in the north of England, that one great reason why the people are estranged from the Church, is the existence of the boxes called pews. That is said to be one reason why the people leave our church; but I do not believe anything of the sort. I do not say that they are not great abominations—they are—but this is not the reason why people leave the church. If they run out of the Church into the meeting house do they not find pews there? The reason lies deeper, a great deal deeper, than that: I believe we must look back many years for the causes which have driven so many people from us. In former years, and especially in the country, the clergy did not preach Christianity distinctly and clearly, and so as to make themselves apprehended by the people; and when the people did not understand what was preached to them they would of course go somewhere where they could. One reason then why people left the church was that in former years there was not always from our pulpits a simple and plain setting forth of Christ. I know that great attractions are offered by dissent. For instance, if I went into a strange church I might find it difficult to get a place anywhere, but if I go into a dissenting meeting house, I am put at once into the chief seat of the synagogue, and my pride and self-conceit are greatly gratified, and that is a sensation which poor human nature generally has a craving after. God forbid that I should speak disrespectfully of anyone's religion, but we all know that amongst many bodies of Dissenters, if a man—aye, or even a woman, or a youth—fancies he has got a "gift" for prayer and exposition, he is at once called upon to exercise it, and to give in public an account of his experience, and so he becomes filled with spiritual pride. All this public notice is to some minds very attractive and seducing, as it elevates them in their own eyes, but it is altogether different from the good old-fashioned doctrines, and unleavened gospel, to be found at the Church. We have heard to-day of many a remedy for the evils complained of, but I will tell you what is the great one. It is that the minister should clearly, distinctly, earnestly, and lovingly set forth Christ as the great Saviour of sinners: that is the apostolic way—that is the commission of the Church—and it is better than all you can do by movements against pews or by ritualism. Understand me, I am not afraid of ritualism—not at all—but I desire to point out the means by which we can best expect to get back the masses of the people to the Church of England. I would say to the clergy do not be afraid of speaking dogmatically. Substantive truth can be nothing if it be not positive. Such great truths as that man is fallen and that Christ has redeemed him, cannot be taught in any other way. Dogma is a noble thing, and the people do not dislike it—what they do not like is to have dogma taught in a doggish spirit. There are two or three other things which, speaking as an humble layman, I may say I think the clergy might do. They should tell the people what the Church of England really is; for the poorer do not know. Not a sparrow falls to the ground without the permission of the great Disposer of Events; and can the church founded by the Saviour Himself, and blessed and kept by Him during all these centuries, now fall? She cannot; but the people should be taught that ours is not a new church which only dates back to the Reform-

tion. No such thing. It is the old church, by God's good providence then purified and reformed. I say then reverend fathers, that the great work is in your hands. We are willing as the laity to do our best to help you; and the people are ready to hear and anxious to receive the gospel. I have no faith in the proposed order of itinerant preachers. They would only interfere with the regular work going on in a parish; and their visits would tend to give the people "itching ears." The result of such visits would be to thin the church, and to fill the Dissenting meeting house. The Church should open her mouth wider, and extend her arms wider, and she would soon have the people of England enfolded in her loving embrace.

The Rev. E. A. HILLIARD : I represent the Norwich Branch of the English Church Union, and in the name of a large body of the clergy I wish to say, with all the earnestness of which I am capable, that there is no object more dear to those who are called ritualists, than to set forth to the people the love of God, through the person of His Son Jesus Christ. We have never voluntarily and willingly lost sight of that great object, in that which is called *ultra-ritualism*. I believe that if the clergy of the Church of England would adopt some simple plan of dividing their services, beginning the day with an early celebration of the Lord's Supper, they would do much to attach the laity to the Church. An early celebration on every Sunday throughout the year would allow the faithful laity a privilege too often denied them; thus, those who received the Holy Communion, and those who were present without receiving—a large class now grievously neglected—would become more and more devoted to the Church. Then, at ten or eleven o'clock, there should be Morning Prayer without the Litany, and the service being attractive and interesting and thus reduced in length, many would be gained who as yet have not wholly given themselves up to God, or shrink from receiving the Holy Communion at all, or perhaps regard frequent communions with disfavour, because they have been untruly told, that the advocates of this system wish to put the Sacraments in the place of Christ. At three o'clock the Litany should be sung to the plain chant of Archbishop Crammer. You would find the children of the Sunday School would take great interest in this; and their little treble voices would sweetly swell the petitions—"We beseech Thee to hear us good Lord." This might be supplemented (at the end of the Litany) by a short address; or by catechizing, which you are bound to do by the Canons and Rubric. The parents would come to hear their children, and thus, through the children, you would instruct the parents. Furthermore, in the evening there should be a proper service—one that should be attractive—with hymns in which everyone could join. Such a succession of services would do much to attract and attach the people to the Church. You will find the choir another admirable means for getting hold of the people. Increase your choirs to the largest extent possible. You should have frequent choir meetings, and encourage the members to tell the clergyman whatever goes wrong, and he would thus be able to put things right at once, and not allow evil to go on smouldering till a serious flame is kindled. In managing a choir, one thing is most indispensable, and that is, to rigorously exclude all evil-livers from a place in the services of the Church. Another great and special help to the clergyman is the promotion of societies by which they can get into contact with the people, and hear their opinions freely expressed, although sometimes contrary to those of the clergy. For this purpose there is the machinery of Parochial Associations of the English Church Union ready to your hand; or you might have "Guilds" of your own formation. The clergy of the Church of England are not half accessible enough to the people. The people cannot get at the clergy. But if the clergy were to carry out the old canon of the sister Church of Ireland, and be every Saturday at the Church, where those who had spiritual difficulties and griefs could come and speak to them, they would do a great deal to reclaim their wandering parishioners. There is a large class of wretched ones who have fallen into grievous sin, but are not wholly abandoned, and in whom the voice of conscience is not altogether dead. They dare not come to Church—they dare not pray—they would run from their cottages if they saw the clergyman coming; but if they knew that the minister of Christ was at the Church for the purpose of listening, lovingly and sympathisingly, to what they had to say, and to give that ghostly counsel which the Prayer Book even now authorises, they would come to him, and thus would many penitents be brought back to the bosom of the Church. I entirely agree with what has been said by former speakers, as to competing with the public houses and music halls; but still more might be done in that way than at present, by well lighted churches, with as gorgeous and magnificent a service as your means will allow. Thus, while you offer to Him who gave the gold and the jewels of the mine, and scattered thousands of radiant hues around us in the productions of

nature, you would, at the same time, gratify the love of beauty in your congregations by means of their Church, and create a craving for a higher and more enduring beauty, even the beauty of holiness.

The Rev. ROBERT W. KENNION, Rector of Acle, Norfolk: We must all have been most thankful to hear the able suggestions which have been made for reaching the hearts of the people of England and for bringing them back to the Church. There is, however, one point of view, which has only been slightly touched by Mr. Higgins, but which is well worthy of further consideration. We were told yesterday that we ought to preach dogmatically, and that our first business is to set forth Christ and Him crucified. But we were also told to declare "the whole counsel of God" and not to keep back any part of our message which may happen to be unpopular; and I do not think we shall do this unless we tell the people that the Church of England is God's appointed ordinance—that the divisions and schisms which exist so largely amongst us are contrary to God's will, who, while He has ordained that we should all love one another as brethren, has also bidden us to maintain unity and order as members of the visible Church, and to submit to the ordinances of man for the Lord's sake. Even the authority of the Scribes and Pharisees was to be regarded because they sat in Moses' seat; there may, therefore, be authority without infallibility. And as authority implies duty, and as we may hope that the people of England are not, like children, guided by mere inclination, and that the sense of duty is still, as of yore, a strong principle in their hearts, I think we should not only try to attach them to the Church by enlisting their feelings, but also show them that it is their duty to join her:—that it is not a matter of personal preference, but is, or ought to be, a matter of conscience and submission to the will of God. On this point I beg to quote the words, not of Richard Hooker, but of Thomas Cartwright, his great antagonist. In a petition presented to Queen Elizabeth, by Cartwright and other Puritans in 1592, they say, "As for the charge of schism, and that we so far condemned the present state of the Church, that we hold it not for any true visible Church of God, as it is established by public authority within the land, and therefore refuse to have any communion with it . . . if this were true, we were, of all men, the most unthankful . . . We acknowledge unfeignedly this our Church . . .

(notwithstanding anything that may need to be further reformed) to be a true visible Church of Christ, from the Holy Communion whereof, by way of schism, it is not lawful to depart."

The Rev. C. F. LOWDER: I understand the subject before us to be the best means of attaching the great masses of the population of this country to the Church. I conceive that the greatest and best means of doing so is to teach them what the Church is; and I am thankful at this Congress the question has been raised, because it cannot be too widely known that the Incarnate Person of the Lord Jesus Christ is set forth in our Church, both in her doctrine and ritual. I need not enter on those subjects, except to say that our duty to preach Christ and the practice of setting forth Christ in our ritual are consistent the one with the other. The highest ritual of the Church, that of the Eucharistic service, is what St. Paul enjoins, namely, "showing forth the Lord's death till He come;" but I rose chiefly to say a few words on the subject of brotherhoods and sisterhoods which combine an organization and teaching well calculated to attract the masses to the Church. I am always sorry to hear unkind expressions used concerning those who adopt a stricter organization and combined life. I desire on the part of those who, as an indignity, are branded with the name of "ritualists," to say that they are most thankful for all organizations whether of men or women in the English Church. We look with sympathy and love on all who work to bring souls to Jesus Christ, because although acting in different ways, we all seek the guidance of the same Holy Spirit for the same great object. There should be between us only a loving and friendly rivalry in our work, whether we live under strict or lax rules, whether as district visitors and parochial mission women or as Monks and Sisters in the English Church. I much regret that the work being done by brotherhoods and sisterhoods in the present day has not been discussed. For myself, I have not had the privilege of belonging to a brotherhood, except in a modified form in a clergy house; but I had opportunities of seeing the immense amount of good done by sisterhoods in nursing the sick, and visiting the poor. They are invaluable in those poor parishes, where there are no district visitors. In the parish where I am located in the east of London, it was a necessity that we should have ladies who would devote themselves entirely to the work of caring for the poor—who would come away from the more favoured parishes in which they lived and settle themselves amongst us. It was a work of necessity and its value was felt when the late appalling

outburst of cholera took place amongst us. We were not taken aback at that time; as soon as the disease commenced they were ready for the work. Had they been merely district visitors, parents and friends would have raised affectionate objections to their dear ones plunging themselves into so much danger; and thus the supply of visitors would have been cut off when it was most needed. It is impossible to over-estimate the value of the labours of these devoted women in the worst districts of the cholera infected parts of the metropolis. They were not known as Mrs. or Miss So-and-so, but as servants of the Church—not as individuals but as a part of the Church's system. How common it is to hear of Mr. So-and-so's parish, or Mr. So-and-so's church, or Mr. So-and-so's mission; but the true idea of a church is that one priest goes and another comes, but yet the blessed sacraments never cease; the holy services of prayer and praise go on ever; and the people are thus drawn to the Church, and are brought to a knowledge of our dear Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

The BISHOP OF NEWFOUNDLAND pronounced the benediction.

DE GREY ROOMS. THURSDAY MORNING.

COLONEL AKROYD, M. P., in the Chair.

CHURCH RATES.

The CHAIRMAN: My duty as Chairman of the Section is a very simple and easy one. I am not called upon to offer any opinion of my own upon this vexed question of Church Rates; but it is my own agreeable duty to invite others to address you whose names most deservedly have weight both upon this and other Church questions, and whose authority is such as to ensure your most respectful attention. This is one of those vexed questions that come up before Parliament every year, and which Parliament finds it most difficult to deal with. I believe it will be an excellent preparation for further legislation that the matter should be fully and fairly discussed out of doors. There are two difficulties in our way: the first arising from the fact that Churchmen are not agreed among themselves about the disposal of the question; the second difficulty arises of course from the opposition of Dissenters. Perhaps the discussion that may take place this morning may somewhat remove the first of these obstacles. However, without further preface, I beg to call upon the reader of the first paper.

ARCHDEACON DENISON READ THE FOLLOWING PAPER.

It is a wise regulation of these assemblies which keeps them out of the arena of political party; and it suits me particularly well; for in what I have to say I shall have to expose the policy of Churchmen quite as much as of anti-Churchmen, of Conservatives as of Whigs, of Liberals, and Liberal-Conservatives (if any man will tell me what that means) as of Radicals. There are definitions of parties very like the plain Scotchman's account of metaphysics: "When two men be

talking together, and the man that is being talked to doesn't understand what the man that is talking to him is saying, and the man that is talking doesn't understand what he is saying to the man that is being talked to—that's metaphysics." So it is with some definitions of party. Neither those who employ them, nor the intelligent British public who listen to and applaud them, have the least idea what they mean. I am almost disposed to think that it is their very vagueness and silliness which is their principal recommendation. It will therefore be perceived at once that my remarks are not those of a political partisan. If they could be so construed, I would not, I assure you, sir, have addressed them, any more than you would permit them to be addressed, to this assembly.

It is another wise regulation of these assemblies that no attempt be made to collect the judgment of those present by way of resolution. But there are ways of arriving at the judgment of a great assembly like this other than the way of passing resolutions. And as it is certainly of importance at this crisis of the history of the National Church that there should be no mistake about the judgment of this assembly in the matter of Church Rate, I hope that, before we have done, we shall arrive at that judgment in some way which shall be clear and generally satisfactory.

At this stage of the history of the National Church of England there are two principal questions between the Church and the Civil Power. There are other grave questions between them; but the principal questions are two, because two include and gather within themselves, as to a common centre, the several clues which guide to all parts of the general issue of "Church and State."

One of these questions has to do with the teaching of the Church of England and the position of the clergyman in her parish schools; the other with the repair and maintenance of her parish churches and churchyards. Questions each in their kind more deeply entering into the substance of "Church and State," cannot be found.

Both questions are encumbered and disfigured with fallacies of every description; and this not on the part of the adversary only, but also on the part of Churchmen. Bishops, Clergy, and People. Both, again, are tests, not necessarily indeed of *stantis aut cadentis Ecclesie Anglicanæ*, but of *stantis aut cadentis Ecclesie quoad nationem Anglicanam*, which is a very different thing.

But in one aspect it is a thing not less important than the other. For the Church of England can only cease to be the National Church by the fault of English Churchmen themselves. Divine gifts are destroyed *ab intra*, not *ab extra*. Now, that a Church is a National Church is too great a gift of God not to involve in its loss danger, and, it may be, even death, to the Church itself, as a punishment for the sin which has caused the loss. I do not, therefore, conceal my fears for the Church of England herself, in relation to the issue of these two principal questions now pending between her and the Civil Power. For when the children are timid, or time-serving and unfaithful, the mother must needs be in distress, and perhaps in danger of life.

And it is to be borne in mind that, even if these questions were in themselves of less magnitude than they are, it is most in accordance

with the record of God's Providence, that things in their proper nature comparatively minute should be tests of man's faithfulness or unfaithfulness to principles of the Divine Law.

The first of the two questions, not in order of time but in order of discussion, is what is called in Downing Street and in the vicinity of Palace Yard the "Conscience Clause" question; but everywhere else the "Anti-Conscience Clause" question. This is not the time and place to discuss this question. The fallacies encumbering and disfiguring it have been disposed of—I am thankful to say, effectually disposed of. Churchmen know now, at least, what the "Conscience Clause" is, and what it proposes to do. They have learnt also what is the real value of the explanation of explanations by the late Lord President of the Council.

The other is the Church Rate question. I may say here that I have some little claim to be heard upon this question; and I beg to return my thanks to the Committee of the Congress for the ready courtesy with which they have recognised the claim. I will not apologise for stating some items of my experience.

I had put into my hands some years ago Mr. Hubbard's Bill first in MS. and afterwards in print; the Duke of Marlborough's Bill, as printed; and Mr. Collins' Bill, of which last Mr. Sotherton Estcourt had at that time the charge. I found in the first lines of each of those Bills the same radical blunder; and having lost no time in communicating with the authors of the several Bills respectively, I received at once an acknowledgement of the blunder in each of the three cases, with a promise that it should be attended to. The blunder was this:—

"Whereas it is expedient that the jurisdiction of the Courts Ecclesiastical in respect of Church rate should cease and determine."

Now, here a thing had been overlooked which is, so to speak, *in limine*. It had been overlooked that a Visitation is a Court Ecclesiastical—not indeed for the recovery of Church rate, but for the supervision of its expenditure; and that the words cited would, if made law, have destroyed such supervision; and would, therefore, in the abeyance of the exercise and regulation of "godly discipline," have left literally no business for an Ordinary to transact at his Visitation, except to deliver a Charge, which would then have become a thing wholly without meaning or purpose. Visitation Charges have, as it is, wandered away very widely from their proper intention and use, which is to ascertain and lay down the principles legally applicable to the disposal of causes in the Court of the Ordinary. But if a Visitation, having lost, as I think most unhappily, the true practice of presentment for scandalous offences, and of taking order for dealing with such presentment, were also to lose the practice of authoritative supervision of expenditure of Church rate, I am at a loss to see what room would be left for a Charge at all, or indeed for a Visitation at all; and not being minded to minister to what would have become only an imposition upon the public, I had pretty well made up my mind, if any such Bill should become law, to decline to hold a Visitation again, and to return into that *otium cum dignitate* which, many people think, belongs especially to Deans and Archdeacons. Cer-

tainly, if the Ordinary had no longer anything to do with the supervision of Church rate expenditure at his Visitation, it is hard to see what he could have to do with it at any time throughout the year; and whatever might be said about the Decanal *otium*, the Archidiaconal *otium* would at least be complete; aye, and the Episcopal *otium*, too, so far as respects Visitations.

The words in the Bills were too wide, because the grasp of the subject by those excellent men who had undertaken to bring them in was not wide enough. They had been thinking only of the recovery of Church rate, the bugbear of the question. They had forgotten all about its supervision. Now it may, or it may not, be expedient that Courts Ecclesiastical should cease to be the means of recovering Church rate. I have no opinion upon this, one way or the other; though I think it by no means so clear a case against Courts Ecclesiastical as it is commonly assumed to be; and I am glad to see that the programme of the Congress promises much information and enlightenment upon this subject. But, I conceive, no reasonable man contends that it is expedient that the authoritative supervision of Church rate expenditure by the Ordinaries of the Church should cease and determine. And yet this is what must happen either under abolition, or under any so-called "voluntary rate" scheme. Who is to exercise any authority over voluntary subscribers? for this is what is meant by voluntary rate payers, and nothing else. It is the clumsiest attempt to conceal a fact under a name that I remember to have seen.

Now there are "Abolition" Bills, and there are "Compromise" Bills. Both show alike how grave a matter it is to propose to deal by statute with a thing so intertwined with the roots of the Constitution in Church and State as Church rate is; lest, in handling it, you not only tear it up by its own roots, but with it a good many things besides by their roots, which you have no intention or purpose to touch. Great constitutional knowledge is required to deal safely with things which, like Church rates, do not lie upon the surface at all. Church rates began in, and has lived through, days which were a good deal deeper than the days in which we live. And the greater the constitutional knowledge, the more ready and exact the appreciation of the difficulty of the thing to be done, and of the danger of making the attempt.

I have had in my hands more than thirty revisions of a Bill, framed by my late dear and excellent friend, Henry Hoare, and also some other like Bills. My comment and answer upon one and all was the same, "Pray don't send me another, because, cut and carve it as you will, the radical fault remains of attempting any such Bill at all." I never could understand what Churchmen have to do with bringing in Church rate Bills. It is not their business. The opposition to Church rate did not begin with them, should not be carried on by them, and cannot end with them. Let those who want to abolish Church rate, because they want to abolish the National Church, as they themselves confess, bring in as many Bills as they please: only I want to see a Bill for abolishing the National Church, which is what is really meant, instead of a Bill for abolishing Church rate; and then we should all know where we were. But what have Church-

men to do with it except to say, "No." What have they to do to make it possible for Mr. Goldwin Smith and the Liberation Society to destroy God's great gift to the English people? Churchmen ought to have known by this time, and indeed long ago, that there is no substantial difference between abolition, and compromise,—as it is called, but is not. You must either keep Church rate as a lawful and legal obligation upon every ratepayer in respect of property occupied, or you must abolish Church rate. You may have a law upon one principle, or upon its opposite principle; but you cannot have a law upon two contradictory principles; not a law, that is, that will survive a year's trial. Now, all Churchmen's Bills propose neither to abolish Church rate, nor to keep it. What they do propose is a bit of one and a bit of the other. I beg to say very respectfully to the authors of these, and all like bills, that it is all waste of time; waste of their own time, waste of the Legislature's time, waste of the country's time; and, if any one in this assembly is going to take the line, the "compromise" line, it will be waste of the Congress's time.

I like to hear both sides as much as any man, when there is anything to be said. But when it comes to such a thing as tampering with great principles of Church and State to suit a political exigency, I, for one, would rather be excused. However, I shall do my best to listen patiently under the infliction, if it is coming. I say the thing cannot be done. You may compromise some things, but Church rate is not one of them, any more than "Conscience Clause" is. If Church rate be touched in its essential character—that is to say, in respect of the lawful and legal obligation upon every ratepayer—Church rate is abolished. It may survive in name for a year or two. It cannot survive a day in its true and proper nature; in the only nature, that is, in which it is worth retaining. Abolitionists, who are better hands at their trade than Church people are at theirs, know this very well, and make no secret of it. Let me read to the Congress a few words upon this point from my speech at the public meeting held at Taunton, in 1860, in support of Church rate:—

A few years ago a committee of the House of Commons sat to inquire into the question of Church rates. A gentleman, a near connexion of my own, who is well known in public life, was a member of the committee; and he told me that one of the committee, a Dissenter, said to him, on leaving the committee-room, "There are a great many learned and eminent men on this committee, but there are but two who seem to understand what it is that we want. You and Sir Robert Harry Inglis know; but you are the only two who do know. We do not care for Church rate—we want to destroy the Establishment.

The latest instance is their eager and unanimous acceptance of Mr. Gladstone's Bill. Why did they accept Mr. Gladstone's Bill? Because it gave them everything they wanted, and left the Church nothing but what she could have much better without any Bill at all. And this is what in Parliamentary language is called a "compromise." I prefer the English language. In the English language it is called a robbery; and it is the worst kind of robbery—a robbery of the poor. What would be said if Parliament was to abolish or to "compromise" Poor Rate,—to transmute it into a voluntary contribution? Now Poor Rate provides for the bodily necessities of the poor:

Church Rate for spiritual necessities and religious comforts. It finds them while they live a church, and sittings free of charge; and when they die, a churchyard wherein to sleep their last sleep. To take away Church Rate is to rob the poor in soul and body, in life and death. Are clergy and laity prepared to maintain tithe, which is the clergyman's endowment, and the layman's inheritance, but prepared to abandon Church Rate, which is the endowment and the inheritance of the poor? I bless God that I can believe that there is amongst us enough of public principle, and equity, and charity to forbid such a sacrifice of truth and justice to a false peace. If Churchmen, then, want abolition—that is robbery of the poor—let them go on bringing in Church Rate Bills. If they don't want it let them put their Bills into the fire, and humbly and charitably, but steadfastly, maintain the inheritance of a thousand years. But if any still cling to the delusion that "compromise" is not abolition—if no effort can open their eyes—if the ingenuous simplicity of their nature be so intense as to defy all attempts to make them apprehend the realities of the case—then all I have to say to them may be comprised in a very few words of a favourite author of mine; and I address these words to them in all kindness and respect:—"Bonè nempe, et amici complures, sed magis amica veritas." Here, then, are the words I mean, Thucydides, V., 105:—

μακάριστας ὑμῶν τό ἀπειρόκακον, οὗ ξηλῶ το ἄφρον.

This choice morsel of a great philosopher and historian I will, with the leave of this good assembly, render freely into English:—

Bless your innocent hearts, what foolish folk you be!

There is a philosophical and practical book upon Church Rate. I daresay there are many: but this is the best. A very good book, as I think, and am told by excellent judges. I refer to it now and then, and always with satisfaction and profit. I have it in my hand now. It is, "Church Rate, a National Trust." By George Anthony Denison, Archdeacon of Taunton. London, 1861.

This good book was written by request, and was properly puffed, but it was not remunerative. Few books are, nowadays, which set forth and uphold principles of Church and State, and do not minister to some unhealthy excitement, some morbid feeling, or some unworthy and unfaithful compromise. But I am not without hope that a few copies of it may still be sold upon my present advertisement of it. I think it may be had at half-price. I have the honour of presenting you, Sir, with a copy.

Let me now say a few words on the position in which the question has been left by the final decision in the Braintree case, February, 16, 17, 1852.

I have always had a great respect for law, and for the general administration of it, particularly in England. But two or three such decisions as the decision in the Braintree case would certainly make the continuance of that respect a very difficult, if not an impossible, matter. Here is a decision which says the repair and maintenance of parish church and churchyard is a thing imperative upon parishioners, but that if a majority of parishioners in vestry assembled don't choose to discharge the obligation, they need not discharge it. What a

mess! What curious jumble of legal and voluntary liability and responsibility! What is the account of it? This is the account of it.

Two things have been confounded in the decision: things in their nature distinct; one the duty of making a rate, the other of fixing the amount of such rate. The second is clearly for the vestry to settle. The first is *ultra vires* for the vestry to refuse. The Judgment has, therefore, always appeared to me to judge and condemn itself, not only as a piece of common sense, which is a very different thing from law, but as a piece of law.

Nevertheless, I am quite content (so good and sound is our case upon all points of it) to stand upon the Judgment for two reasons. First, because by placing the making of a rate *per se* in the power of the majority of a vestry, it has cut away all pretext or shadow of grievance. If all things else in the country are settled by majorities, and nobody complains of any grievance in respect of the manner of such settlement, though he may have the strongest opinion that the matter of it is unjust and dangerous, why is the rule not to be extended to Church Rate? Why is Church Rate to be put in an exceptional position any more than Church Tithes? Is it because many of those who would abolish or compromise Church Rate would lose nothing by doing away Church Rate,—but are lay-holders of tithes, and have livings in their possession or in their gift;—or is it that the Tithes' time has not yet come? Another reason is that, sooner or later, if Ministers and people of the National Church do their duty faithfully and charitably, there will be no majorities in vestry against the question of a rate *per se*, though there may often be against the amount of a rate. All evidence concurs to show—and every day more clearly—the reasonableness of this expectation.

There is one exception to the course of this evidence, and that is the late refusal of a rate by the parish of St. Mary's, Taunton. Of course this will be cast in my teeth, so I will cast it in my own teeth and bite it at once. I am not an inhabitant of Taunton, but I am its Archdeacon, and have a warm interest in its well-being—and I used to have a great respect for the good sense and right-feeling of its people. This last has received a severe shock, from which it may take time to recover. But I make my opponents a present of the case, if they will kindly remember to return it when the good folk of the place come to their senses next year. St. Mary's Taunton has done what mischief it could, but I don't think it is much to any one except to itself.

Things are unmistakeably mending throughout the country in respect of this question, but statesmen or quasi-statesmen must be tinkering, meddling with and muddling the deepest questions, with the best intentions and the worst success: and hence the crop of questions, resolutions, committees, commissioners' reports, and bills *in re* Church Rates, which, from the time of Mr. Hawes' question, June, 1833, down to Mr. Gladstone's Bill, 1866, have infested Parliament.

For Mr. Gladstone's Bill I have this to say,—that, if all the blunders and faults, and impracticabilities and vices of all Church Rate Bills for the last thirty years had been carefully got together and put into one Bill, the Bill would not have been so bad a Bill as Mr. Gladstone's

Bill. For a Bill coming from a mind which proposes to regenerate empires, I have never seen anything so impractical and delusive and so dangerous—no, not even the “Reform Bill” of 1866. It calls itself a peace offering. Now a thing more calculated to perpetuate and engender strife:—to perpetuate heart-burnings and jealousies in parishes where these already unhappily exist in reference to this question, and to engender them where happily they do not—could not have been contrived. The *Guardian* newspaper, which seldom misses an opportunity of proving that its name is a misnomer as respects Church and State (some might say, as respects the Church itself)—the *Guardian* newspaper, as a matter of course, writes up the Bill. It would not be the *Guardian* if it did not. What the writing up may be worth is another matter. The *Times* and the *Guardian* are commonly in accord upon Church questions; but, upon this Bill they are apart. The *Times* knows English people better than the *Guardian* does.

I have already expressed my opinion upon the Bill in a *gravamen* presented in Convocation with thirteen reasons annexed. It was signed by 47 members out of 53 present in the House at the time. I hold it in my hand. There has also been a memorial to the like effect issued by the Archdeacons of London and Middlesex, which has received the signatures of more than 50 of the Archdeacons of England and Wales.

In writing to the late Attorney-General, whose name was upon the back of the Bill, I told him that it would have been as well that a Bill which concerned especially ratepayers in country parishes should have shown at least some knowledge of the habits and feelings of ratepayers in country parishes. It is the absence of all such knowledge from the Bill which has made it to be received in and out of Parliament ἄσβεσῶ γέλῳτι. I doubt indeed whether, since the days of Vulcan and Olympus, there has been anywhere upon any occasion γέλως so ἄσβεστος. What the ancient laughter would have been if Vulcan, instead of limping about serving out nectar, had taken a seat and read to the august assembly, *inter pocula*, Mr. Gladstone's Bill, I cannot pretend to say. Perhaps the author of the Bill, who knows more about Homer than most men, may be able to tell us. However, the modern laughter has done one thing—it has effectually extinguished the Bill.

I desire to be fair, and I will therefore allow that the Bill has had one merit. I speak in the preter-pluperfect tense, because the Bill is dead and buried. It has had one merit. It has so exposed the “Compromise” folly that nobody will touch it again. Now Parliament won't have Abolition at any price. Parliament can't have “Compromise.” What remains? It remains that Church Rate keeps its place among the institutions of the country.

It has always seemed to me that the atmosphere of Downing Street is peculiarly unfavourable to the growth of knowledge of the habits and feelings of country folk. But this Bill transcends. It is instructive to see—so soon upon the heels of the “Conscience Clause”—another conclusive example of the stultifying power of the locality. And it is not out of place to add here that the Bill smacks strongly of that habit of testing and adjusting everything by the condition and

separate interests of the towns, which forms so large a part of modern English statesmanship. Now, I am for caring well for the towns. What man in his right mind would not care well for them? But I don't see why the country is to be sacrificed to the town. Many town clergy, and town parishioners, are much troubled with selfishness in this matter. They find it comparatively easy to replace Church Rate by some illegal contrivance, such as paying for sittings in a Parish Church; and they put aside for them, what they know very well, it is not so easy a matter to replace in country parishes. There are, on a moderate estimate, some 8,000 country parishes which rejoice in Church Rate—which have never had anything else for the support of church and churchyard; which are satisfied not only that nothing else can suit them so well, but that there is nothing else that can suit them at all. There are other parishes, country and town, which had set aside Church Rate, but which of late years, having had their eyes opened, have returned to it; and, to please other town parishes and some few country parishes, which having lost, have not yet recovered, their senses, all parishes alike, town and country, are, it seems, to be robbed of Church Rate. The great immemorial right and duty of parishioners in vestry assembled to assess themselves, within the parish bounds, for purposes of public utility, is to be broken down in a principal particular.

To sift in detail the whole crop of fallacies which have been grafted upon this question would make me far exceed my allotted time. They may be found stated and exposed pp. 187-288 of my book. All I can do here is to gather them up into two classes. First, the fallacies of Anti-Churchmen; second, the fallacies of Churchmen; to point out where the two classes run up into one another, and where they are distinct.

And I make this division not only for convenience of arrangement, but because it is the only division which corresponds with the true state of things in England at the present day.

There are now no public questions which divide decent and respectable men in England who want improvement and not revolution. No questions, I say; for there is one question, the greatest of all, which divides men who are decent and respectable as above. Are you for maintaining the National Church or are you not? And when I use the term "National Church," I mean a Church Catholic and Apostolic—not a "Broad Church." Are you for extending the National Church as best you may, or are you for breaking it down bit by bit till you abolish it, all the time declaring that you are its best friend? There are decent and respectable men in England, not being revolutionists at heart, whatever they are in act, who would, if they could, abolish the National Church. They disclaim all such purpose indeed, most of them, and say that the National Church has no truer friends than they are. But this is unnatural, and *ex hypothesi* it is absurd. A Nonconformist cannot be a true friend to the Church of England *simpliciter*, any more than he can be a true friend to it in its national aspect. It is a contradiction in terms. He may like the Church of Rome, or rather I should say he may dislike it less, knowing very well that he may choose between the two; and this is, I suppose, what he means. He knows very well that it is no question between

"the Protestant sects and denominations" and the Church of Rome. Protestant sects and denominations have no power of their own to resist Rome. It is a question between the Churches. Statesmen of the present day appear, with rare exceptions, to be judicially blind to the fact that every loss inflicted by Act of Parliament on the national position of the Catholic and Apostolic Church of England is not a boon to the Nonconformists, but so much gain to the Church of Rome.

The Church of England lets the Nonconformist do a good many things which the Church of Rome would not; so he dislikes it less, but he cannot love it. If he does, his Nonconformity becomes something of a very aggravated description. The Church of England is kinder to him than the Church of Rome would be; and so, like many other people who are well treated, he "tries it on," to use an expressive phrase of common life.

But it is not only Nonconformists who "try it on." There is an argument often implied, sometimes stated, by men who are not Nonconformists, viz., that the National Church is so strong that it can afford to have an injury or two done it to please the Nonconformists. I forbear to characterize this argument in the only terms which correctly describe it. There is an august assembly in which it is not uncommon.

In this assembly we are all, I suppose, of another mind. However, any way the question of "National Church," or "No National Church," is the one question of the time. All other divisions of party are obsolete this side of democracy and revolution. All decent and respectable men are, I suppose, for improvement cautious and gradual, and not democratic or revolutionary, in the representation of the people. All, so to speak, are free traders. All are for non-intervention. All are for no bullying of little peoples, and no cringing to great peoples; neither for stimulating revolutionary tendencies on the one hand, nor for discouraging tendencies to freedom on the other. For England's business is well understood not to be a political propaganda, but to hold her own under God; that is, so to hold it and to improve it as to do her work and discharge her mission throughout the world.

All other divisions then being obsolete among decent and respectable English people, there remains, and, I suppose, always will remain to the end of the chapter, the great leading division out of which all our political divisions originally sprung; to which they all converge, as to a common centre; in which they all finally issue, and which is the true key to them all,—National Church, or no National Church. This is the one division standing out in our times bold and clear, and asserting, every day more and more unmistakeably, its place of pre-eminence in Parliament. It has been stripped of a good many coverings which have hitherto encumbered it, and obscured its proportions, and which being, in fact, only excrescences more or less unhealthy, have come from time to time into the place of the true substance. Now that these have disappeared one after the other, we know where we are, and what we have to do. It is a sign of the great goodness of God towards this people that, as the position becomes more ascertained, there is found amongst us a truer and more self-

denying appreciation of the responsibilities which it lays upon us all, Bishops, Clergy, and People. If it be a great thing to be an Englishman, to be an English Churchman is a greater thing still. Of them to whom much has been given will much be required. May we have grace to go forward humbly, thankfully, steadfastly, faithfully. May we have grace to maintain in all its integrity, for the good of the whole nation, the National Church—not the Establishment apart from the Church—not the Church apart from the Establishment—but both in one as given into our hands to keep. It is our special inheritance; and, through us, it is our children's. We have to keep it for them, and through them, for coming generations. Let us take heed that, at least, it suffer nothing in our hands.

For the two classes of fallacies; on the Anti-Church side all fallacies may be gathered up under one head, "Church-rate is a grievance to many English citizens."

Dolus latet in particulari. It is not Church-rate which is the grievance; it is the National Church which is the grievance. Given the National Church of England, and Church-rate is an inseparable accident of its constitution and position. Church-rate is, for the time, the cry of the assailant, but what is assailed is the National Church. The bolder and honester among Anti-Church rate people avowed this distinctly many years since,¹ but the fallacy still prevails very widely—the fallacy that, if Church Rate was got rid of, hostility to the National Church would be got rid of with it. It is a wonderful thing to see sensible men delude themselves after this fashion. It is always the cuckoo cry, Give up this, or give up that; things, be it observed, by the way, which are not one of them yours to give up, but are trusts for you to keep. Give up this and give up that, and you will have peace. You give it up, against your better judgment, with much contempt for your own cowardice, and with many a twinge of conscience as a trustee, and you find yourself, as you might have expected, farther from peace than you were before. Give up Church Rate, then, and what will you have got rid of? not of one particle of hostility to the National Church, but of a principal outwork in the line of defence of the National Church. The line will have been turned, and the outwork taken, and the enemy will have occupied it in full force, cheered and stimulated by the success for which they are mainly indebted to the cowardice or the treachery of the defenders.

This great fallacy is common to all half-informed or less outspoken Nonconformists, and to all Churchmen, more or less, who bring in or support "Church Rate Bills." These Bills, one and all, proceed upon the assumption that there is a civil wrong, and therefore a grievance, which is absurd; so absurd that I cannot stay to argue about it. But I may say, by way of illustration, that I have often wondered how Nonconformists, who cry out so much about the grievance of Church Rate, are so easily content to have particular portions of the public cemeteries provided, and set apart for them, by a rate the greater part of which is paid by Churchmen. What an odd, and not very respect-

(1) See report of proceedings at Taunton, 1860, p. 7, quoted above. Also evidence before the Lords Committee.

able thing is a grievance of conscience oftentimes, and especially when it comes across a saving of money.

The opposite fallacy is distinctly the Churchman's fallacy, and runs through all their Bills. To my mind, it is the worse of the two; being quite as mischievous and much more silly. Here it is; that if you surrender the principle of Church Rate, that every ratepayer in the land is lawfully and legally bound to pay Church Rate for himself, and for those who are not ratepayers, you must have a *quid pro quo*. This is the pet crotchet of my dear friend Beresford Hope, and some other excellent men.

Now it is conceivable that the giving up a right without a *quid pro quo*, may in some cases tend to make peace, though it clearly would not in the Church Rate case. But the giving up a right with a *quid pro quo* has no tendency to make peace in any case. Then again, what a truly mean and miserable *quid pro quo* is this particular *quid pro quo*. You must have, it is said, the power of excluding Nonconformists who won't pay, and Church people who don't pay, the rate from Church vestries, &c.

Upon this let me say that if to abolish Church Rates with a clean sweep be to abolish the principle of a National Church—which it is—it is no less to abolish the principle of a National Church to make it the Church of a portion of the people and not of the whole people. Abolition indeed has this advantage, that there would be no mistake about it and would leave you in a position to be magnanimous and generous. But whoever heard of a magnanimous and generous man who got a *quid pro quo*? It is then a contradiction in word and act to propose to maintain a National Church with one hand and to shut out from it a part of the nation with the other. To give such counsel is to serve the Church ill. Children may deny and reject the parent; but it does not follow that the parent is therefore to deny and reject the children. Better have all our rights and privileges abolished at once, than barter them away for a price which it is a sin to take.

This brief account of the two leading classes of fallacies appears to me to dispose of the whole substance of the case. For the rest I respectfully refer my audience to my book.

It is not a pleasant thing to have to ask why Church Rate is sought to be abolished, and why it is assumed that it is a thing which will be destroyed by general consent. It is not pleasant to have to ask the question, because the answer is not creditable to any part of the English people. The abolition of Church Rate then is proposed, and is assumed to be a necessity, not in order to satisfy any claim of truth, or reason, but in order to satisfy the exigencies of political party, and this at the expense of rights and privileges of the National Church, which it is the sworn duty of the Civil Power to maintain unimpaired.

For some 300 years there have been Nonconformists in England. But the Anti-Church Rate cry is only 33 years old. It dates from 1833.¹ It was then devised as a convenient hustings cry in a day of popular frenzy against the Church, having just so much surface plausibility about it as to make it useful for electioneering purposes,

(1) Bogue and Bennet, *History of Dissenters*.—London: Svo., 1833. Vol. 1., p. 198.

without containing one particle of truth or reason, social, political or, religious. Its 33 years of life has answered to its birth. It has been, and is, a disgrace to all parties in the country; and, indeed, to all individual citizens who have not stood in the gap, of which last number I am happy to say I am one.

Nevertheless it is said by pompous and pretentious men, of small information and less principle, that the National Church cannot stand upon what they allow to be her undoubted right: her right, be it remembered, for the use and benefit of the entire people, not of Church people only, but of the whole community, and especially for the use and benefit of the poor? Why cannot the Church stand upon her undoubted right? Is it because God has cast her off? Is it because she is proved unworthy of the protection of the Civil Power? or is it because Churchmen have lost faith in the position of "Church and State," and either do not trouble themselves to understand what the position is, or, understanding it very well, are content to betray it?

I am for keeping Church Rate intact. If it is said that it is impossible to keep it, my answer is that nothing is impossible which is right. I hold that no Bill has been brought in for what is called "the settlement of the question" upon this or that basis of alleged compromise, not of actual surrender, which is not incomparably worse than an Abolition Bill; combining the wrong and injury of abolition with the ludicrous delusion that you are doing a thing which makes for peace. I hold more. I hold that no such Bill can be brought in. I do not believe that the materials for it have a place in *rerum natura*.

I tried once, for curiosity's sake, to put myself in the position of a "compromise" man, and a very unpleasant time I had of it: very hurtful to my health of body and mind. In this exceptional phase of my life I made a Bill of two clauses and a proviso, and was so disgusted at my own production, though the least mischievous of any that I have seen, as to be effectually cured of the compromise disease even by way of a curious experiment.

To sum up what has been said. I put the matter upon this plain issue; and I desire to be met upon it.

I say that a Church is not a Church established by law, that is, a National Church, in which two things are not found: One, either provision out of the public funds, or the guarantee by public Act, that is by common law or statute law or both, for the maintenance of Bishops and Clergy: the other, the like provision or guarantee for the maintenance of church and churchyard.

I say, therefore, that a Church, which has been established by law, ceases to be a Church established by law, when the guarantee for the maintenance of church and churchyard which had subsisted from time immemorial is taken away by public Act.

Let, then, Mr. Harcastle upon whom the mantle of abolition has fallen, or Mr. Gladstone upon whom the mantle of compromise is supposed to have fallen (two mantles differing in colour but in all substantial respects the same), bring in a Bill for abolishing the Establishment of the Church by Law—for making, that is, "Church and State," a thing of the past. This would be a proposal outspoken,

intelligible, fair, and above board, whatever else would have to be said of it. Let us have done with Bills which are only feats of political jugglery, and neither say what they mean, nor mean what they say.

I say then, with all respects to this great assembly, keep Church Rate intact. It is the key-stone of the arch. Pull it out, and stone after stone will follow, till the arch itself, with all that rests upon it, collapse in one common ruin. That Church Rate may be kept intact, all that is wanted is a truer appreciation by Churchmen, Bishops, Clergy, and People, God helping them, of what is meant by "Church and State;" a truer appreciation of the greatness and the excellence of the gift contained under these words—of the duty of preserving and extending it—of the danger of neglecting it, of the guilt of betraying it. Where the knowledge of these things is, there is no room for fear that constituencies will not be exact and explicit with candidates upon this question, and that members will no longer trifle with it, as some have done,—vote, that is, for Abolition Bills, only because they know that it is impossible they should pass into law,—but will more clearly apprehend their position as representatives of electors who are persuaded in all their heart that the first thing to be done for England by her children,—the thing without which all else that is done for England is worth nothing,—is to maintain and promote the living power of that great watchword, given, with reverence be it said, from Heaven itself into the keeping of English Sovereigns, and their People, and written on the heart of a thousand years, "Church and King."

THE REV. H. MASTER WHITE READ THE FOLLOWING PAPER:—

It is generally assumed that the Church of England in general, and the poorer members of the Church in particular, have a strong interest in the maintenance of the present law of Church Rates. It has been said "The abandonment of Church Rates is the abandonment of the poor."¹ I venture to think that this opinion is erroneous, and that the poor, and indeed the whole Church, would be benefitted by the total abolition of the whole system of Church Rates. For this view, which has been adopted neither hastily nor recently, I will state my reasons as shortly as I can.

What is the Church Rate? Some regard it as a Church property, part of the Church endowment of this country. There was some reason for so regarding it when it was supposed that the churchwardens alone, or with a minority of the parishioners, could make a Church Rate even if the vestry refused it—and that it was legal to vote for a rate, but illegal and void to vote against it. It was decided however in the Braintree case that a rate made by a minority was null and void in law. There is no rate therefore unless it is voted by a majority: and this makes a clear distinction between the Church Rate and a rent charge or other endowment, the payer of which has no vote or option, either as to the amount of payment he has to make, or as to his liability to pay it. Any man can, as the law

(1) Report of the Committee of the House of Lords on Church Rates, Q. 1284.

now stands, exempt himself from paying a Church Rate, if he can persuade a majority of his fellow parishioners to refuse the rate, and there is no legal power to compel a majority to vote a rate against their will. The courts of common law have no power to enforce the repairs of a church: and the simple refusal of a Church Rate is no ecclesiastical offence, though an ecclesiastical offence is committed, if in consequence of that refusal the church becomes dilapidated.¹ Every parish, therefore, is at liberty to maintain and repair its church by the offertory or any other reasonable way.

A Church Rate, then, is not a property or endowment, but an ancient customary and legalized method for raising funds for local church purposes by what is called local "self-taxation." Some may say there can be no hardship in "self-taxation." But the phrase "self-taxation" is true only of the body of the parish, not of the individuals composing it. No one cares for a right of self-taxation as regards himself: every man can tax himself as much as he pleases for any object whatever. The right of self-taxation is valuable only when a man by taking his own share upon himself renders his neighbours liable for their share of the burden. The special value of a Church Rate is that it compels those who do not care about certain religious privileges, to bear their share in supplying them, lest those who do care for them should have to support the burden alone. If you exempt from paying the rate every one who chooses to be exempted, the whole value of the system is gone at once.

The Vestry is legally the assembly of the whole parish: but, in fact, only a minority numerically of the parishioners have a right to be present, or to vote at a Vestry. For this right is limited to occupiers of property rated to the relief of the poor. The Vestry is a meeting of ratepayers, not of parishioners. The ratepayer has, in virtue of the payment of rates, a voice in the Vestry for Church matters, where churchwardens are elected, churchwardens' accounts examined, and many important questions relating to the fabric and ornaments of the Church decided, since the churchwardens often cannot act without the consent of the Vestry.

Let me point out some of the evils that are the natural result of this state of things to the Church of our own day.

1. The voice in Vestry is given to property, not to Christianity, much less to Churchmanship. A Jew or an Infidel has a right, if he is a ratepayer, to vote in vestry upon questions concerning the local interests of the Church. This is wrong in principle. But this wrong did not exist in old days when the law enforced conformity to the Church even more strongly than it enforced the payment of Church Rates.

2. Non-occupiers, even though Churchmen and Communicants, are shut out from the Vestry, and thus deprived of a voice in local church matters. This exclusion works mischief since it tends to weaken the practical sense of Church-membership. Men talk of preaching the Gospel to the poor, and of the service done by Church Rates in maintaining the Churches for the use of the poor. Yet the Church Rate system makes us treat the body of the poor not as

(1) *Prideaux' Duties of Churchwardens*, pp. 248, 256.

brethren, but as dependants; as those who have no voice, no right to be consulted in local church arrangements. At the same time many well educated and intelligent Churchmen are similarly excluded—perhaps the curate of the parish. The late Reform Bill admitted that the class of lodgers, &c., was so influential as to deserve the political franchise, and this was looked upon by all parties as a measure of lateral extension of the franchise. Is it wise to shut them out from the church vestry?

3. The concentration of power in the hands of the ratepayers has been conducive to the development of the iniquitous pew-system. Ratepayers have assumed that the church was theirs, and have parcelled it out for their own convenience with utter disregard of the rights of the other parishioners. "I pay rates, I have a right to a pew of my own," is a claim often made and allowed. So the poor have been thrust into a corner, or shouldered out of the Church, and the "pew-of-my-own" system having been once admitted, the smaller ratepayers, who cannot possibly all have pews, have treated it as a wrong as well as an indignity to be offered a "free seat" among the poor. Church rate bills that propose to take away from those who claim exemption from church rates their "claim to a seat as of right," assume that ratepayers have rights in pews which other parishioners have not.

4. The Church Rate system has been a great obstacle in the way of Church extension. The people have said, "We are willing to pay rates for one Church, for that is the old custom; but not for two or three; so we won't have another Church built in our parish." Incumbents have refused to let a district be assigned to a new Church, on the plea that it would exonerate the district Church from payment of rates to the Parish Church. Parishes indeed have been divided, and districts assigned; and these objections are less frequently made than they used to be: but it is notorious that Church Rates have often created bitterness and strife between the mother Church and the daughter Churches.

5. The Church Rate system creates a bad feeling against the Church, where a large proportion of the people have been alienated from the Church: the call of the rate collector turns indifference into active opposition. The clergy of Birmingham and Nottingham gave evidence before the House of Lords that any attempt to enforce a Church Rate in those towns would be very injurious to the Church, and that the general feeling towards the Church had improved since Church Rates ceased to be asked for.¹

6. The Church Rate system fosters the spirit which says—"I will pay a legal demand, but I will give nothing voluntarily for the Church." If you wished to stop the progress of Church Restoration and improvement, how could you do it more effectually than by enacting that no Church should be built, restored, or improved, except by money raised by Church Rates? There are men who refuse to subscribe for the repair of a Church, because 'that ought to be done by a rate'—and 'they hate any approach to the voluntary principle:' they forget that even the Law of Moses gave wide scope for free will

(1) R. C. R. C. 302, 305, 1120.

offerings—and that there is no life or love without voluntary action.

7. The property of the country is not equally liable to Church Rates. One kind of property is rated, another kind escapes. Why? Because it is the custom. Lands and tenements are liable every where: stock-in-trade is liable where it is the custom. But property is held now in many other ways, and escapes rates altogether; not because it ought to escape by any original principle, but because when Church Rates were first made no such property was in existence. How differently Church Rates would fall if they were to be levied on the principle of the Income Tax. One penny in the pound is estimated to raise £250,000 in the whole country in *rates*, £1,000,000 in *income tax*; a penny in the pound on *wages* would raise nearly £2,000,000. The Church Rate system says to such holders of income, you have nothing to do with providing or repairing Churches for the people: that duty belongs to ratepayers.

I believe then that the Church Rate system is doing positive injury to the Church in many ways, and that churchmen are really interested in clearing it away. I have said nothing of the claim made by non-conformists to be exempt from Church Rates. The plea of a conscientious objection to pay Church Rates may be alleged sometimes where it is not felt; but I think we cannot deny that it is in some cases felt very strongly. I own that I should greatly dislike paying a rate—a self-imposed tax,—to a religious body that I did not belong to: therefore I can make allowance for similar feelings in other men: perhaps this inward repugnance is sometimes inaccurately called conscience. But some think that there are two or three objections to the abolition of Church Rates, which outweigh any reason that can be given in favour of such a measure.

Objection 1.—The present holder of a property is *dishonest* if he endeavours to free himself from a payment subject to which he bought or inherited his property.

1. I answer, that the repeal of the window tax, or the insurance duty, is a much greater relief to many owners of property than the abolition of Church Rates could be. But we do not charge the statesmen who passed those measures, or the owners of property who supported them, with dishonesty. It is quite fair and right to repeal a tax that is unequal or otherwise injurious.

Objection 2.—The maintenance of Churches by voluntary offerings attempts to combine the use of the Churches by all with the maintenance and repair of them by some: which is impossible, and if possible manifestly unjust.

2. I answer that this combination is possible, for it has been made by the Church Rate system. Church Rates are not paid by all: both rich and poor escape them as long as they are not occupiers. I may leave it to the advocates of Church Rates to show that this is not manifestly unjust.

Objection 3.—The abolition of Church Rates is a step towards dissolving the union between Church and State.

3. I answer, that if that union is to continue, the terms of union must not be made intolerable to either party. A practical grievance, or the appearance of a grievance which embitters men's minds, works far more effectually for separation than the retention of a right of this

kind does for the maintenance of the union. If you wish to give the advocates of separation a tool to work with, leave the question of Church Rates in its present condition.

But if Church Rates are to be done away, what is to be the substitute? Injurious as Church Rates are, there is no substitute that insures the compulsory payment of the money which is not far more injurious. I need not argue against a charge on the Consolidated Fund, a commutation into a Rent charge, or a charge on the Ecclesiastical Commissioners; for these schemes have failed to win support and died a natural death. The schemes now under debate are chiefly schemes of exemption. Some say—1. Exempt nonconformists, and make the rate compulsory on churchmen. Others say—2. Exempt any one who chooses to be exempted, but at the same time take from him certain privileges.

The first of these plans gives a direct premium upon dissent. I remember one case that shewed plainly its natural effect.

A Dutch Church at the Cape of Good Hope had been built many years ago by a Church cess laid on all the property in the district. In course of time the Church was out of repair, and funds for the work of restoration were not forthcoming. The Dutch Elders applied to the English Government for an ordinance to lay the cess on the district again. The English residents in the district loudly protested against being made to pay for the repair of the Dutch Church which they did not use. The Government at last offered to propose an ordinance to lay the cess on all members of the Dutch Church in the district. The Dutchmen consulted together: they judged that to lay a tax on their own members exclusively would help to alienate all those whose allegiance was in any way doubtful, and though they had hitherto been most eager for the ordinance they declined the offer altogether.

The second scheme, viz., exemption for all who wish to be exempted, with, perhaps, the exclusion of those who claim exemption from a place in vestry and some other privileges avoids this great evil; still it is liable to serious objections.

1. It is said that a system of exemption practically works well in many parishes where no proceedings are taken against non-payers, and so difficulties are avoided and opponents disarmed. I answer that the reason why exemption has succeeded in such cases is that the average Englishman has a profound respect for the law of the land: he looks upon those who break the law as offenders, and will not bring himself into the same class with them. The law of the land is that Church Rates are to be paid if duly voted; so he grumbles and pays them. But if the law is changed and exempts every man who claims to be exempted, this feeling will cease to operate: it will become a question of balancing so much privilege against so much payment. Ratepayers one by one will decline to pay, and leave the burden on their neighbours' shoulders; these neighbours will see that as property is withdrawn from the rate their own share increases: the 2d. rate will quickly mount to 4d., 6d., 1s., and the unfairness of the whole proceeding will force itself on the dullest and most unprogressive understanding. I know that this process is at work in parishes where the unauthorized, I may say illegal, system of exemp-

tion has been tried for a few years. Men, who thought they had made a great discovery in allowing such exemption are becoming tired of it.¹ Some rely on small parishes going on in the routine if the old formality if the rate is kept up. I do not believe that they will: and if a voluntary rate of this kind is tried, and fails, the Church will be in a far worse position than it is now.

2. A compulsory rate upon one kind of property like the poor rate may be fair; but a voluntary rate on the same property falls very unequally. A voluntary rate is in substance, though not in form, a subscription. No one expects to obtain subscriptions in proportion to the value entered in the rate book. The owner of £5000 a year may be rated for the same sum as the farmer who occupies 150 acres adjoining the rich man's garden. Ought the subscriptions of these two men for Church purposes to be equal? If a voluntary rate were tried, this inequality of incidence would break it down.

The exclusion from vestry, &c., of those who claim exemption from Church Rates, may protect the rights of churchmen where a Church Rate is made: but where no Church Rate is made, and where none could be made without grievous injury to the church, no one need claim exemption, and the fiercest opponents are left with all their power of interference in church matters. I feel very strongly that there are hundreds of parishes which do not pay Church Rates now, where either a compulsory rate, or voluntary rate would seriously hinder the progress of church work.

I maintain then that for the sake of the Church, Church Rates ought to be done away altogether, and with them the whole system on which they are grounded. The rate being abolished there is no reason whatever for constituting ratepayers into a Church Vestry. Should then every parishioner have a voice in vestry? A strong reason against this is the fact that a great many of them are not churchmen at all, and that abolition of Church Rates, is loudly demanded as an act of justice to those who conscientiously differ from the Church. If there is any justice or equity in this demand,—and I think there is some—there is a much stronger claim of equity that those who do so differ should, when they are relieved from Church Rates, be also relieved from all control in the management of the Church's business.² If church business is to be done for the Church's benefit, it is unjust to give power of control to those whose ultimate desire for the Church is her utter destruction. The anomaly of having church affairs managed by those who have no interest in her welfare is bad enough now; it would be infinitely worse to keep up that system when the rate which alone gives it plausible support is done away. The principle for which I contend is to make a Church Vestry open to all churchmen and to none but churchmen, among the parishioners. If this principle is accepted, I care but little for the precise manner in which it is carried into effect. My own suggestion is that a register of declared churchmen be kept in every parish. It would suffice for this purpose if a book were prepared headed with a declaration similar to that already sanctioned for members of committees of National Schools.

(1) C. R. C. R. 440—442.

(2) C. R. C. R. 834. Mr. S. Morley says, "I feel that a Dissenter is out of his place at the vestry if this question (*i. e.* of Church Rates) is once settled."

"I the undersigned, being a parishoner of A. do sincerely and solemnly declare that I am a member of the united Church of England and Ireland, and I hereby claim to be enrolled in the list of declared churchmen of the parish of A."—or it might be better, since a claim is made for all dissenters that they are non-conforming members of the church, to put—"I am a conforming member." This plan avoids "ticketing dissenters" directly or indirectly,—for a great many real churchmen would not take the trouble to register themselves, and the only loss they would suffer would be that they could not take their place in vestry till they had done so—at the same time it would give perfect liberty to all who really care about taking a part in vestry business to do so. I cannot but think that it would be a great practical advantage to have a vestry thus composed, instead of the usual vestry of ratepayers, many of whom have no real interest in the welfare of the church, and only care to keep down expenditure in order to save their own pockets or to avoid giving offence to neighbours.

The plan I have suggested involves some other alterations of the law: it would be necessary to separate the Parish Vestry from the Church Vestry in order to keep the ratepayers' secular rights intact;—to abolish the legal compulsion to serve the office of Churchwarden,—and to relieve Churchwardens from the various secular duties with which they are charged. These duties might be devolved on the overseers, unless it is thought worth while to create new officers, Parish Wardens, to perform them. I assume as a principle that the non-payment or abolition of Church Rates ought to affect those rights and privileges only which belong to a Church Ratepayer as such, and not those which belong to a parishoner generally.

"But can the Church of this country bear the loss of so large a sum as £250,000 a year? The chief part of this sum comes indirectly from the large landowners of England, and they have not asked to be relieved of the charge. Why should they be relieved?" If they accept the relief and do not give to the Church in some other way, what they now pay in Church Rates, the loss will be theirs. The sum may be easily made up by the offertory; if out of every £5 earned in wages one penny is drawn by this means into the Church Treasury, the sum raised by Church Rates is more than replaced.

I believe that if Churchmen cheerfully accept the abolition of Church Rates, and boldly meet the call upon them to maintain and to multiply the Parish Churches for the use of all, the abolition of Church Rates will be an era, not in the Church's decay, but in the renovation of her strength and vigour. I look forward to the abolition of the whole system on which Church Rates rest, as a means of releasing ourselves from false principles which hamper our liberty of action as Churchmen, and of abolishing many of the prejudices which alienate the middle and lower classes of society from the Church. The people do not love the Church the better because they do nothing for it. If we convince them that they have a part to bear in the Church's work, and in keeping their Churches open, not as a religious luxury for themselves, but for the common worship of the faithful, we shall have reason to be thankful for that clamour which made us look into and give up a system which is doing more harm to ourselves than it ever did injustice to others.

DISCUSSION.

Mr. J. M. CLABON, President of the Church Institution, said: The Church rate question has long seemed to require a solution, and it is at last being solved by time. It was the agitation in the parishes that formed the alleged reason for legislation, and that agitation has nearly ceased. Litigation is almost a thing of the past. The parishes are now quietly paying or quietly non-paying parishes. There is no need for legislation. It will be well to recall to mind the various proposals which have been made from time to time with reference to Church rates, and to state briefly the reasons why it is not expedient to pass any one of them? The first is the proposal to *abolish Church rates* altogether, and we may pass it over with but few remarks. It is the offspring of a few extreme liberals and of the Liberation Society. We know well that Church rates do no injustice to Dissenters; they took their property subject to the payment, and if it were abolished, they would pay so much more rent to the landlord. We know well that an Established Church benefits, in various ways, the whole of the community—that it keeps up a standard of religious teaching for the country—that dissent flourishes under its protectingegis. Moreover, this abolition is not asked for as a simple measure—but as one of a series having for object the entire separation of Church and State, and the seizure of all the property of the Church, lands, tithes, glebe houses—nay, of the very Churches and Churchyards themselves. At the annual meeting of the Liberation Society in 1866, a Mr. Fletcher, said: “Every measure which they carried through Parliament was sapping the foundation of the Establishment.” The Society was formed on the ground, “that an Established Church was productive of numerous and most deplorable evils, spiritual, moral, political, and social;” and, “that there was but one way to protect society from its evils, and that was to uproot it altogether.” The statistics of the question are important. There are about 14,200 parishes and Ecclesiastical districts in England and Wales. Of this number, about 1800 are new parishes and districts. The funds for the repair and services of the Churches in them are provided by other means than rates, and they may be left out of the question. Of the remaining 12,400 many, from various reasons, do not require, or cannot have, a Church rate. In a large number there are special endowments and legacies, which supply the means. In the parishes in many large towns Dissenters, whose strength is among the middle classes which form the principal part of the population, have succeeded in preventing the levying of Church rates, which have become things of the past. The parishes where, for these various reasons, no Church rates are levied, amounted to about 3200, as appears by the annual return to Parliament. There remain 9200 parishes in which Church rates are levied. Why should not these 9200 parishes, (and I believe that the number is on the increase) be permitted to go on, quietly rating themselves? It was among some of the 3200, that there was agitation and litigation. Our departed friend Mr. Knott, whom we all so much respected for his individual worth and for his labours in the cause of the Church, calculated the number of parishes in which Church rates were refused at 5 per cent. of the whole number, being 700. Well, the agitation was successful. No rates are made or even asked for in the 700 parishes. There is practically an end of the matter for them. There has been little, if any, agitation among the 9200 parishes. These 9200 parishes are principally rural parishes; and if Church rates were abolished in them, there might be difficulty in keeping up the repairs and services. There is often no resident landowner, and the clergyman is already overburdened. It is in the towns, the centres of population, that the voluntary system answers. I was at Bolton last week, where one munificent Churchman is rebuilding the Parish Church, at an estimated cost of £30,000. I live near a Church which was built by one Churchman, at a cost of £10,000. But it might be different in country parishes; and why, when all is quiet, should they not be permitted to raise the necessary funds, quietly, by rate, as heretofore? The next proposals have been for a compromise. One proposal was to raise a rate for the repair of the fabric only, and to leave the services to be paid for by other means. But this would cut off one-third of the amount of rate, and there is no more reason for abolishing a part of the rate than there is for abolishing it altogether. If it were really desirable now to compromise the question, this plan would have this advantage, that it would leave untouched the great principle that the State is bound to support the churches. But on the other hand, it is openly alleged by those hostile to the Church that if the fabrics were repaired by a special rate, made for that purpose only and paid by every one, the churches and churchyards must be deemed the property of the State, and be used by all denomina-

tions alike. There is weight in this argument, and its validity is now generally admitted by Churchmen. The next proposal was that adopted by the House of Lords' Committee on Church rates—the investigation by which Committee did so much good to the Church by showing clearly who were her enemies, and what were their designs. It was, that every one who declared his dissent from the Church should be exempt from payment. The objection to this is, that it surrenders the great principle for which we have been so long contending. But a strong disposition has been evinced by many Churchmen to accept it as a compromise; and we have been told, almost on authority, that the Episcopal Bench would do so. The Dissenters have said that they would not accept such a measure, because, according to their phrase, it would “ticket” them, as being Dissenters. In other words, that to gain the benefit of the exemption, they would have to declare that they were Dissenters. Now as honest men are accustomed rather to glory in declaring their creed to the world, it is difficult to conceive why Dissenters should be ashamed to confess what they are? No weight should, therefore, be attached to this argument. Mr. Gladstone's Bill comes under this head. Its object was to exempt Dissenters from Church rates. But it went much further; for it would have enabled any person, for any or no reason, to refuse payment. In proposing to enact that those who pleased might make a voluntary rate, it would have fettered the raising of voluntary subscriptions, for which purpose Churchmen require no Act of Parliament. Its details were most imperfect and objectionable. Dissenters might have taken part in the proceedings of a vestry, to join in throwing out a rate; and if unsuccessful, might have refused to pay it. The clause excluding those who did not pay from the right to a pew, would have put an end to the grand old rule that the Parish Church is the Church of all the parishioners. The provision for dividing the office of Churchwarden into a Churchwarden who was to be the officer of the Church and a Churchwarden who was *not* to be the officer of the Church, would have led to indescribable confusion. The measure, in fact, was open to all the objections to the simple exemption of Dissenters, and to the simple abolition of Church rates, and to a great many more. You will find the objections stated in the report of the executive committee of the Church Institution, which after very full discussion, was adopted by the Council of that body, then by a very numerous meeting of Archdeacons, Rural Deans, Clergy, and Churchmen, brought together by the Institution—and which afterwards received the sanction of the majority of the Rural Deaneries, and was to have formed the basis of Lord John Manners' opposition to the Bill, had the late Government continued in office. Mr. Newdegate's Bill for limiting the amount of Church rates, and charging it on land, making it payable by the landowner, has hardly received the attention which it deserves. The main objection was that it proposed to exempt altogether those parishes where Church rates had not been levied for a certain time. But it should have further consideration by Churchmen, before the idea is abandoned. With reference to all the proposed measures of compromise, it is to be said generally that if it is not necessary to legislate for the abolition of Church rates, there is no need for a compromise of the question. Agitation and litigation are passing away. The natural conclusion is, that it is not necessary to legislate at all. I am bound to add on the fullest consideration of the whole matter, my opinion that total abolition is better than compromise. A member of the executive committee of the Church Institution, (Mr. Darby) has prepared a bill for improving the law of Church rates. The effect of it is to abolish the jurisdiction of Magistrates, to provide tribunals of appeal, to the Ecclesiastical Court for matters of substance and to the Quarter Sessions for matters of form—and to enact that where there was no appeal within a fixed time, the rate should be leviable without question, in the same manner as a Poor rate. The law with reference to the making of the rate was to be left untouched—the law as to appeal from it and to its recovery was to be improved. But the executive committee never proceeded to the complete discussion of the Bill, feeling that the time had not come to ask Parliament to assume that Church rates were to continue, and to facilitate their recovery. My conclusion then is, that no legislation is now necessary. I beg permission, before I sit down to say a word as to the necessity for more complete union among Churchmen, in order that we may the more effectually resist the attacks of the Liberation Society. We of the Church Institution hope we have done a great deal, but we ought to have been enabled to do a great deal more. Where the Liberation Society has five agents and five lecturers and five publications and £5—we have only one agent, one lecturer, one paper, and £1. Churchmen of all shades of opinion, it is true, support us. But while they differ among themselves on other subjects, they will not readily combine for any purpose whatever, even of

defence. Dissenters of all denominations join vigorously in the attack. Churchmen disputing amongst themselves, and generally on minor matters, do not sufficiently combine for the defence. A more enlarged charity, a recognition of the earnest zeal and honest purpose of others, would go far to cure the evil. Let all Churchmen look more to themselves and less to their neighbours, and the result will be a better combination in the defence of the Church, whom we all love so well, as a State Church—for the benefit not only of its present members, but of the whole community committed to its charge.

Mr. HUBBARD, M.P.: You must have felt with me that the paper of Archdeacon Denison, amusing as it was, would have been perfectly in character fifty years ago. I have had the advantage of listening to a great many discussions on this subject in Parliament, and I have been present at a great many meetings out of Parliament, and the result of my experience is that the great difficulty of arriving at a solution of the subject arises from two facts. On one side you see men clamouring for the abolition of Church rates with a single eye and purpose. They have strongly in their own mind the fact of this country having adopted the idea of civil and religious liberty; but they are utterly blind, obtuse, and oblivious to the fact of a National Church. On the other side, men like my friend Archdeacon Denison have strongly in their mind's eye the great and not to be sufficiently acknowledged gift of a National Church, but they are utterly oblivious of the policy of the country in the march of civil and religious liberty. And while these conflicting views are held by men taking part in the movement, it is perfectly clear we shall never come to a satisfactory solution of the question. Let us try Archdeacon Denison's arguments by the facts patent to all. What are the definitions he laid down with regard to the National Church? He says the National Church—which, of course, all of us wish to preserve—is endangered by an adjustment of the Church rate question. A National Church, he said, is the Church of the whole people, and not of a portion only. Upon Archdeacon Denison's definition, the National Church is gone long ago. No Church, Archdeacon Denison said, can be called the Established Church of a country if the funds required for the maintenance of its fabrics and churchyards are not absolutely secured and ascertained by the force of law. There again I submit that, according to the Archdeacon's own definition, we have long ceased to have an Established Church, because we cannot deny that if you take the whole of the population and property of the country into consideration, you will find that the bulk of both lies on the side on which Church rates have been abrogated for years. Archdeacon Denison therefore, upon both propositions, has entirely cut the ground from under his own feet. References have been made to the attempts to settle the question by a compromise. Now, compromise is a word I hate, because I take it to mean a surrender of principle. I will be a party to no compromise, but I do not call that a compromise which is an act tending to assimilate our legislation upon one point to the rule of policy which has been accepted by the country. We have accepted Nonconformists into the high offices of the State, and have relieved them from every disability but one, and that is, in the matter of Church rates, a pecuniary disability. If I wish to stand well before my country as a Churchman, the last point in which I would preserve any mark of oppression or superiority would be one of money. I do not want their money, and I look upon it as an inconsistent and unwise policy which will simply, upon the score of funds, seek to perpetuate this charge upon Dissenters. Mr. White, in support of voluntarism, adverted to the funds which are raised with such ease and with such liberality on the part of the givers, whenever a great building is required for God's service, or when the restoration of some venerated temple built by our ancestors was required. He argued that, because on some casual and interesting occasion, requiring a momentary though perhaps great sacrifice, the supplies were immediately provided, you need never call in vain for the yearly or monthly contribution for the maintenance of the ordinary repairs of the Church. I hold that the two things are entirely different. There are numbers of people who will make great sacrifices for an object which may be novel and interesting, and of which they may presently see results to recompense them for the sacrifice they make; but the yearly out-paying of money, for a result which is unseen and unfelt, requires a degree of devotion to your cause which very few people are able to maintain. Therefore it has been wisely enacted that on the same principle as we find it desirable to raise money by an equal taxation of property for State purposes, so shall money be raised for the yearly maintenance of our Ecclesiastical fabrics. The proposition has been made to form a fabric fund, separate from that required for the services of the Church; but to any such proposal I entertain the most unqualified repugnance. We value our Churches not

because they are landmarks in the parish, but because they are God's houses, devoted to His service; we value the Church for the Church's use; and to make a fabric rate separate from the service rate would be simply encouraging that most lamentable delusion that the fabrics may be abandoned to the nation if only the nation will agree to pay for them. One of the previous speakers made a remark with reference to a scheme which he thought would be effective in the event of Church rates being abolished. A more ingenious reversal of the existing state of things I never heard of. In the different schemes for the adjustment of the Church rate question there have been several distinct stages. Sir R. Phillimore, Sir W. Page Wood, and other Churchmen, not forgetting Mr. Crosse, whom I am happy to see present to-day, have at different times proposed adjustments of the question; and they have always acted upon the principle of meeting the complaints of Dissenters upon their own ground. A Dissenter, when asked to help and maintain your Church, refuses because he has to pay for the maintenance of his own place of worship. If compelled to pay both, he says and feels he has a grievance, and I cannot say he has not. We must recollect that it is not only the old inherited property that is charged with Church rates, but all property of a certain character, although it may be the creation of a man's own industry. And if that man happens to be a Dissenter, maintaining his own place of worship, he has a natural repugnance to pay for the Established Church which he never uses. We met the man upon his own ground and said, "If you are a Dissenter you shall be exempt." A bill for that purpose was presented to Parliament, and the first remark made to me was, "Your mode of exemption will not do, because you are ticketing Dissenters." The comment made upon that objection was that it was a contradiction that a man should boast of being a Dissenter to advance an object, and refuse to be called a Dissenter to accomplish it. Mr. White, in his eccentric proposition, reversed that arrangement, and suggested that Churchmen and not Dissenters should be ticketed—that Churchmen, after abolishing Church rates, should register themselves to make themselves a new body upon whom the Church rate was to be levied. The measure which it has been my fortune to present to Parliament for two sessions has always been withdrawn because I found our own party would not support it, and I have now ventured to print that bill for the consideration of this meeting. I quite agree that the Church rate agitation will resolve itself into a question of time, and that when the clamour against it is found hopelessly unsuccessful, the abolition measure will cease to be brought forward, or it will be done for the purpose of merely hooking upon it some other grievances which Dissenters complain of. When year after year Parliament rejects abolition, it says, "Willing as we are to give reasonable relief, we will not accept a measure which will prevent Churchmen raising money among themselves for their own establishments." The rejoinder to Churchmen is—"Bring forward your own measure." That is not an unreasonable request, and it is in compliance with that challenge I ventured to put upon record a measure which I think ought to satisfy Dissenters as well as Churchmen. When the occupier claims exemption, this measure shifts the demand to the owner, and property has always been rightly, and I trust will remain, charged with the payment of Church rates. It does not remove the obligation upon property, unless the owner also claims exemption; and we must remember that at the present moment wherever the Dissenters are in the ascendant there are no Church rates. It would act as a boon to Dissenters only in those parishes where they had a portion of the property, and were a minority. There, I admit, those Dissenters would have the advantage of that exemption, and their exemption would throw an additional burden upon the Church owners of property. But when I have said that, I have exposed the whole of the loss which Churchmen would suffer. What does it amount to? I do not believe Churchmen would lose one-tenth of the £250,000 which is now raised by Church rates; and certainly that would be a very small price to give for the perfect ease and independence and better organization we should have in the conduct of our own church vestries and in the disposition of our own money. The measure to which I have referred I have endeavoured to make as public as possible, in order that it may be well considered. And, I trust, whatever may be its fate, the result will be that, by showing our anxiety to meet all the fair objections of Dissenters and the utmost liberality in dealing with them so far as pecuniary claims are concerned, we shall put ourselves in a position of great advantage in resisting any measure for total abolition. I believe there are numbers of men in the House of Commons and out of it who, thinking Dissenters have a grievance, would gladly see some means of reconciling their desire to give justice, with their own determination to maintain the Church Establishment. I believe a measure like mine gives them a

vantage-ground on which to realize their wish, while it will strengthen us to resist the aggression which I believe to be as unprincipled as it is impertinent.

MR. ASHETON CROSSE: I should not have said a word upon this subject to-day had not one view of this very important question been mentioned by previous speakers. It is a question that pressed itself very much upon my mind when I had charge of a bill upon this subject in the House of Commons, and a question to which I wish to draw your attention to-day. It is, before you discuss what you will do with Church rates, and whether you will abolish them or not, will you ask yourselves, what are Church rates? Why were Church rates ever fourded? Why did Church rates ever become a law in this country? When you have settled these questions, then say what you will do with them in the present day. When Church rates originally became the law of the land there was a common obligation upon every one in the country to pay them in respect of his property, and that common obligation lay upon a person in respect of his property because at that time with the common obligation there was a common benefit conferred upon every parishioner in the parish. Before you can stand up for Church rates on the ground the Archdeacon has done to-day, before you can say that if you take them away you are robbing the poor of their inheritance, you must show the people of this country and the Dissenters, first of all that the parish church of the present time is the church of the poor as it was at the time Church rates became the law of this country. I am not at all sure that if a law were passed simply declaring that Church rates were only to be levied in those parishes where the parish church was free for the poor and for every one in the country, the greater part of the objection to Church rates would not disappear from the face of the country. Before you quarrel with the Dissenters for the opposition they have raised to Church rates, will you ask yourselves, in how many places have Church rates been lost by the operation, before the Liberation Society started, not of Dissenters but of Churchmen themselves? And they have been lost by the opposition of churchmen for this reason,—the parish has been separated and a district church has been formed. Take the case of any large town. Take the parish of Manchester or Oldham. When the district churches around these towns have been started, those persons who go to the district churches have still been forced to contribute the Church rate to the old mother parish church, and they have themselves raised the objection that Dissenters have now raised, that they are compelled to pay money to a church to which they actually go, while at the same time they have had to take care of the repairs and services in the church miles off to which they never go. The first thing the Church of England ought to do is to put her own house in order, and make the parish church the church of the poor without appropriated seats. Let the seats be appropriated by the churchwardens year by year, or service by service, as may be most convenient; but restore first the parish church to the poor and then collect your Church rates,—not for churches miles away, but in the district where the people pay the rates. It is the practical view to take to look at it in this way, because while all this talk and attempted legislation is going on, we members of the Church of England may do wonders towards solving the question, if we will but apply ourselves to the practical question of making our churches free, and collecting our rates for our district churches. Mention has been made of the £250,000 part of the question. Yet we are not talking about any such paltry sum in the world. If it were such a question as that, I would not stand here to open my mouth for it. It is not a question however even putting it in that way of £200,000 a year. Apply your Church rates to the proper places, and in fifty years time you will get not 9000 parishes or churches paying Church rates, but 100,000 parishes, and instead of a revenue of £250,000 the amount would be ten times larger at the least.

THE REV. M. W. MAXOW: I stand here in the difficult position of not having been able to agree with any speaker who has preceded me in the schemes they have mentioned for a settlement of this question. I crave your indulgence while I put forward a method which may be just worth considering. I quite agree that the first thing you ought to do is to know what Church rates are, and I very much go with the remarks made by the last speaker as to the method of collecting Church rates and their application. But I would observe all plans of compromise are a little beside the question, if you have to fight a life and death battle at this moment for the existence of Church rates. They are nothing, if the Church rate is done away with. I will combat first what I believe to be a fallacious though common statement that it is not a legal demand unless made by a vestry. People say a Church rate is not a legal charge until it is made. I believe that is fallacious. In the great debate in the House of Lords in 1858, we have the

advantage of the opinions given by the law lords. Lord St. Leonard's said, "there was not a man in their Lordships' House who held any species of property the enjoyment of which was more sacredly guarded by the law of England than was the obligation to pay Church rates. By the law of England Church rates were a charge upon the land of England, and that law, at this moment, bound every man's property throughout the country. For centuries this had been a charge on the property of the country, and their lordships were now asked to go back to the voluntary principle, and leave it to every man to pay Church rates or not, just as he chose. Everybody admitted that the fabric of the Church must be preserved, but to maintain the fabric of the Church money must be found, and who was to supply it? For ages the poor of this country had been furnished with regular and stated opportunities and facilities for hearing the Gospel preached without being called on to pay a single shilling, but now it was proposed entirely to alter that beneficent arrangement. It is the right of the poor at the expense of the rich: not depending upon bounty, but on an *actual legal liability*. He who improperly withholds his assent robs the poor. Your lordships are asked to commit this spoliation for your own benefit. If your lordships had now to provide for the maintenance of the fabric of the Church for the first time, he asked how they could do it more easily and effectually, and at the same time less objectionably, than by the system of Church rates, which was now established by law. They did not want any new law for providing for the preservation of the fabric of the Church. It was an axiom of law that there was no right without a remedy. Here there was an incontestable right, but in many cases the remedy was gone, because the Church had no longer the means of enforcing it. Upon the general question he held it to be the duty of every good subject to give effect to the law as he found it for the benefit of the whole community. Their lordships' estates were all charged with the payment of Church rates for the benefit of the poor as well as the rich, and they were not at liberty to divest themselves or their property of that obligation. If they did, they, the land-owners of England, would put millions of money into their own pockets at the expense of the poor throughout the country." It is well worth here remarking that if the sum be only the £250,000 mentioned, yet if it be capitalized at only 3 per cent., you will get a property of at least £10,000,000—therefore, if you take this away, you will be taking away ten millions from those to whom it belongs, especially, the poor of this country. There is also a brief sentence upon the same topic by Lord Campbell, not an authority likely to strain a point in favour of Church rates or principles. His Lordship said: "When he was in the House of Commons no one dreamt of abolishing Church rates without providing some equivalent, and it appeared to him that to adopt a different course now would be most unjust and impolitic. It would, in short, be setting a most alarming precedent. There was no doubt whatever as to the obligation of the parishioners to keep their Church in repair; but the means of enforcing that obligation had failed. Before the Reformation the parishioners who refused to do their duty were cut off with bell, book, and candle; but the remedy provided by the civil Courts had not proved so efficient as that mode probably was. He was not prepared to say that Church rates were property in the sense that tithes were; but they exactly followed the analogy of an obligation to repair a road; and to pass the Bill, therefore, would materially weaken the security of property." Lord Wodehouse, commenting upon what Lord St. Leonard's had said; said,—“The arguments which had been advanced by the noble and learned lord against the Bill, were not, in his opinion, of much intrinsic weight. The noble and learned lord had stated that by law Church rates constituted a charge upon land; but how, he would ask, could that be the case when it was shown by a return which lay upon their lordship's table that there were 500 parishes in which the rate was not paid at all? The fact was that it was a charge which the majority of the inhabitants of a particular parish might or might not impose upon the land as they pleased, and of which the owners of property might rid themselves, provided they could get the majority to accede to their views.” Lord Wodehouse's remark called up Lord Wensleydale, whose opinion is second to none in matters of this kind. He said: “I have necessarily paid to this subject the greatest attention, having had, as a judge, the duty of giving my opinion in all the several cases which have occupied the courts for several years past, with respect to the Braintree Church rate. I assisted as a judge in the Court of Exchequer chamber, when it was decided on a writ of error from the Court of King's Bench, that the churchwardens had no power to make a rate if the vestry would not; and again, when that Court of Error held, by a majority, that a minority of the vestry could make it, if the major part refused to do so; and lastly, when this house asked the opinion of the judges, and finally reversed that

decision. On the argument of the first of these cases, I sat with my late lamented friend Lord Chief Justice Tindal, who delivered the opinion of the Court, and laid down and explained the whole of this branch of law in the clearest and most satisfactory manner. I may take upon myself, therefore, to state with perfect confidence what the law is. With all deference and respect to my noble and learned friend opposite (Lord St. Leonard's), he is not *perfectly accurate* in stating that at common law *every man's estate* is subject to the burden of Church rates, though, practically, from early times it has been so: but that remark induced a noble friend of mine, who spoke after him (Lord Wodehouse), to state that the burden of Church rates was not imposed by the common law, but by the voluntary act of the vestry. My lords, it was undoubtedly a mistake of my noble friend. In the full and satisfactory judgment to which I have referred, it was distinctly laid down that there was at common law *not an option* but an *absolute and binding legal duty on every parish* to repair its Church; and no judge, in the course of the long discussions which have taken place in these late years, has even intimated a doubt on this subject. This legal obligation is analogous to that on parishes to repair all highways within their limits, save such as individuals are bound to repair *ratione tenuræ*, or a township by custom, or others specially exempt. It is analogous to that on counties which are bound to repair bridges, with similar exceptions, and the mode of performing this duty, in every one of these three cases, was the same. In the time of Lord Kenyon, an attempt was made to enforce the making of a Church rate by mandamus, but it was held, and it must now be considered, that the non-repair of Churches is matter of Ecclesiastical cognizance, and more than that, exclusively so. The Court of King's Bench has no power to enforce the obligation by mandamus, unless the rates have been pledged for money borrowed by virtue of an Act of Parliament, in which case that Court will enforce the payment of the rate by applying that remedy. If it had been decided that the repairs of the church could be enforced by the common law remedies, I believe that the payment of this rate would have been regularly made, and we should not have had those disputes which, unfortunately, in late times so extensively prevailed. But, my lords, notwithstanding the want of these means of enforcing the performance of the undoubted legal obligation, attaching to every parish, it is not to be assumed that there is no remedy. The Ecclesiastical Court will proceed to punish those who are contumacious, in refusing to concur in making a Church rate. Upon a clear case presented to the Court, shewing that the party complained against totally refuses to perform his duty, the offender may be punished by writ *de contumace capiendo*, and imprisoned for six months; and there are instances of the exercise of such jurisdiction since these disputes began, and within a very few years. But this remedy is expensive, and beset with difficulties; and how can it be effected where in some populous parishes five or ten thousand would have to be proceeded against? Practically, therefore, the legal obligation, though *undoubtedly existing*, may be said to be incapable of being enforced; but still *every one ought to obey the law, and is not morally excused from obedience by the chance of impunity, any more than a person would who should commit a more serious crime, when he knew it would be easy to escape punishment*. I happen on more than one occasion to have had to attend meetings convened for the purpose of raising a Church rate, where I reside in the country; they were attended by some very respectable Dissenters; a few objected to Church rates as contrary to Scripture; others, who did not feel that objection, yielded to the argument that there was a legal obligation, and that they ought to obey the law, though there was a difficulty in punishing the offence of disobedience. I cannot help thinking, that if it was generally well understood, that there is an absolute legal duty to contribute to repair the church; and that there is *not*, as a great many suppose, a mere *voluntary option by law which the vestry may perform or decline, at their discretion*, to provide for the repair of the church, there would not be the difficulty which in many places, unfortunately occur." Mr. White, I think, denied there was any power in the Court to punish. There is not practically the power, because you could not inflict that penalty without greater evils coming, but it is important to bear in mind, Church rates are a legal obligation. Lord Derby also took part in the debate, and in the course of his speech he said: "It is quite true, as has been stated, that although, practically speaking, Church rates do not constitute a direct tax upon land, yet their payment involves a personal obligation in the case of every inhabitant of a parish, which obligation can be enforced only by having recourse to the means which a person may happen to possess in the parish; in other words, to the land of which he is the occupier. The rate is, therefore, to all intents and purposes a charge upon property itself. It is, moreover, a charge which when one

buys or sells property always enters into the question of the value at which it is to be estimated. My noble friend behind me stated a case in which some centuries ago a member of his family purchased the tithes of a particular parish. Those tithes were estimated at a certain amount, and he obtained them at a lower price than he otherwise would, because in virtue of his being proprietor of those tithes, and therefore as lay rector of the parish, he would have to defray the expenses connected with the repairs of the chancel of the Church. Now, let me suppose that my noble friend's ancestor had paid a sum of £2,000 less than their real value for those tithes, in consideration of his having to devote a sum of £100 per annum to the maintenance of the chancel, and that, being a Dissenter, he should, after the bargain had been concluded, turn round and say, 'To keep up this chancel would be to act in opposition to my conscientious feelings. True, I have purchased those tithes for a sum lower than the estimated amount, because I undertook this obligation, but I beg to be excused from adhering to the terms of our bargain, because I do not happen to be a member of the Church of England.' What, I ask, would your lordships say to conduct such as that? Would such a plea be listened to either upon the principle of law or of morality for a single instant. Church rates, then I contend—a charge though perhaps fluctuating in amount, yet capable of being estimated by striking certain averages—are a tax which the Church of England has a right to receive upon the one hand, and which every landlord throughout the country is bound to pay upon the other, as a debt upon his estate from the liquidation of which he must not hope to escape upon the plea of conscience." I was going to touch upon the kind of property Mr. Hubbard mentioned, but the Chairman reminds me, that my time has already expired. All I can say is, that even with regard to new property, I cannot conceive how it stands in a different position, because it is bought subject to an outgoing which is allowed for in the price given for it. But it is hopeless for me to attempt to say what I was going to say, or even in outline to sketch the plan in which I think a solution of the question might be found. I may perhaps endeavour to put my thoughts into a pamphlet. I merely now contend that the Church rate is the property of the poor of the country, and if I have given proof that this is so, independently entirely of the vote of the vestry, I shall not, perhaps, have wholly wasted the time allowed me.

The REV. J. M. DU PORT: I am afraid Mr. White's argument goes a great deal too far, because, say what you will, it must end in the abolition of poor rates. As to the manner in which the rate is raised, permit me to remark that income does not pay poor rates except so far as that income arises out of land. It is very easy to account for the fact that there is no Parliamentary obligation to compel a parish to make a Church rate; the reason is that in the days when Church rates were established, if a parish paid no rate at all it would be compelled to do so by interdict, an act which would be a far more powerful engine than Parliament, because by its means a parish was deprived of all means of grace, and no service whatever could be held. In days when ecclesiastical privileges were more valued than they are now, a prohibition of that kind would have more value than any enactment. During some of the speeches this morning, I have been asking myself, is the case of Church rates so hopeless that, like an out-manœuvred army, we are obliged to lay down our arms and ask for the best terms of surrender that our conquerors will choose to concede to us? Is all the litigation of the last thirty years to be thrown to the wind? Have we learnt nothing from all the careful arguments urged on both sides of the question? I think we have learnt two most important things. First, that parochial matters will not henceforth be mismanaged as they once were; and secondly, we have learnt that by Dr. Lushington's most elaborate judgments the law of Church rates has been most clearly settled. All this has been made known throughout the country by the exertions of the Church Institution, and therefore churchwardens have now only need to be careful in observing certain formalities, and they may proceed to the enforcement of their rates without fear of the quirks or quibbles of the Liberation Society. In the last three cases brought before the Court of Arches, the defendants have been condemned to pay the rates and costs besides. It is plain that the Liberation Society is driven to its last stronghold, that the last means of attack are resorted to. If you will refer to a book entitled "The Vestryman's Guide,"—a book which is the organ of the Liberation Society—you will find on page 90 that the author particularly discourages any opposition being made to Church rates on the ground of the inequality of the assessment. He quotes Dr. Lushington and his predecessors to prove that opposition on that score is entirely hopeless. I say, then, that when we now find the Liberation Society driven to its last means of attack, it is not a time to talk of surrender. I had a church rate case myself which was decided in my favour at the beginning of this year, and the defendant was

obliged to aver in court that he was assessed at too low a sum. Now, when objections to Church rates amount to such as that they are not worth answering. But is nothing to be done? I say we need reform in the Ecclesiastical courts. We certainly do need reform in the Ecclesiastical courts, and I am glad to be able to state that in the case of the parish of Mattishall, Norfolk, a reform was introduced by evidence being taken for the first time, *viva voce*, in the Court of Arches. Now, the witnesses are brought to London, and come face to face with the judge, while the counsel may put to them any questions he pleases. The truth is much more likely to be arrived at in that way than the old system. It is to this fact that I attribute the success of my own case, and others. I am satisfied that a churchwarden who has honestly made his Church rate, and seeks to recover it, will cut no worse figure than he who refuses to pay because he is assessed at too low a sum.

THE REV. W. R. CLARK: I should not detain this meeting if my Archdeacon had not given me notice that he intended to say something about my own parish, and, although he has let us off easily in what he said, he tells me there is more to be printed in the official report. I think it is a duty that some of us should give the result of our experience on this Church rate question, and state why they agree with—not exactly a compromise, but—a modification of the present system. I should say from my experience that a bill embodying the first and fourth clauses of Mr. Hubbard's bill would satisfy most Churchmen and Dissenters. I do not think the Dissenters have any real grievance. If we have a National Church, there is nothing more reasonable theoretically than that the Church should be supported by the property of the nation. Nor do I support this proposition because I think we shall conciliate the Dissenters. I do not think it is possible to conciliate them, or that we should try to do it if it were possible. We shall both be better if we keep our own principles. My reason for holding that some concession of this sort ought to be made is not a theoretical one, and is not dictated by any of the considerations urged by the last speaker, such as, that we are now beaten and forced to surrender. Undoubtedly the Churchmen of this nation should retain Church rates if they think it profitable or desirable for the nation. One reason why Mr. Hubbard's proposition should be adopted is, that it is founded upon the working of the Church, and the good of the Church in towns. No one who has not had actual experience can tell the vexatious character of the proceedings necessary to make and collect a Church rate in a town. In my own parish a number of Dissenters banded together—I hope from the best of motives, and I have no reason to question them—and declared publicly in the newspapers that they would pay no more Church rates, even if the rates were made. The churchwardens, I believe, paid the rates for them for two or three years, and then they summoned them. But they did so too late; and the case was given in favour of the Dissenters; and at the last poll of the parish they lost the Church rates. I think there was hardly good ground for the Archdeacon speaking of the town clergy and people as being selfish. I can answer, for my own parish, we should not have continued this contest so long, if it had not been that we did not feel it right to leave the country parishes in a difficulty. I believe, therefore, if some exemption of the kind mentioned could be made, it would be of the greatest benefit to the town parishes not only in the way of restoring peace, but as removing obstacles to the restoration of Dissenters to the National Church. This Church rate question is a continual sore in towns. No doubt it is an ignorant cry that church people want to tax others for the support of their religion; but the cry has a certain plausibility amongst poor people, and makes them look upon the Church as an oppressive church, whereas the Church rate, as has been well shown to-day, is quite the reverse. Let me briefly answer two objections. It is said, especially by my able and respected friend, Archdeacon Denison, that if we make this concession to Dissenters we are substituting expediency for principle, and giving up the principle of a National Church for the convenience of town parishes. If there is any force at all in this objection, we have given up the principle of a National Church long ago. We did it when the Jews were admitted to Parliament; and I cannot see how, after admitting Jews into our Parliament, we should make so much difficulty about conceding this liberty to Dissenters. Moreover, there is, with an extreme difficulty in making a legal rate, an impossibility of collecting it when you have made it, unless you are prepared to distraint the goods of defaulters. Then there is the difficulty of carrying the rate—not from the number of Dissenters, but because some church people—you may call them illogical, and it may be said you cannot get a principle into the heads of church people—do not like to carry on a war with their fellow Christians, and towns' people. They would rather put their hands into their pockets than carry on this warfare with those with whom they would live on terms of amity, and who are their friends, and in

many cases relations. One word on behalf of this much-abused word expediency. I really do not think there is any eternal principle in the nature of things requiring the imposition of Church rates. When we are told that Church rates is one of those principles that expediency is to set aside, I ask to be told where is the everlasting principle that imposes Church rates, or requires us to levy them on Dissenters? I do not see it. I believe the whole question of Church and State is nothing but a question of expediency. Paul said there were things lawful that were not expedient. Expediency is the highest principle by which a man can be guided, so long as it does not interfere with any eternal principle in the nature of things. I wish those who are constantly throwing the word "expediency" in our teeth would be kind enough to tell us what they mean. I have not so read history as to think the exemption of Dissenters from the payment of Church rates would separate Church and State. I find, at all times, that modifications and moderate changes are the best means of warding off Revolution. Pig-headed opposition to reasonable suggestions has, in the long run, led to great and sweeping changes. It was remarked not long since by one of the leading newspapers, that the College of St. John's, Oxford, stuck out so long against any reform in its constitution that at last a very sweeping one had to be made. I look back to the French Revolution, and many such events that have disfigured the history of the world with blood-stains and crimes, and the lesson I learn is, that if we, in time, make moderate concessions, we may stave off or prevent great and serious evils. If it should be, however, that the exemption of Dissenters from Church rates should lead to a separation, there are things more valuable to us than Church and State united. I would rather see the schismatic and sinner drawn into the Church, even if she were denationalized. But I have no fear for the Church. "God is in the midst of her; she shall not be removed; God shall help her, and that right early."

The Rev. J. D. MASSINGHAM: We have had to-day the "no surrender flag" of our friend Archdeacon Denison, who is such a good specimen of a jolly Englishman, that you cannot help admiring him when you differ from him most. Then, we had the sweeping broom of Mr. White. I confess that the latter is much the more distasteful to me. I do think that until our clergy themselves understand the Church rate question, what are the arguments brought against it, and how to answer those arguments, the case is hopeless for the Church of England; and I do regret to hear clergymen who ought to be standing up for the privileges of Church rates, falling into some of the grievous errors and misstatements made by Dissenters themselves. For instance, we have heard this morning, and that, not from a Liberation Society advocate, but from a clergyman of the Church, that it is an unjust thing, and hindering to the extension of the Church, because differences are allowed to exist between parish and district Churches. Surely every clergyman understands that *that* is one of the things that require alteration. I think it is a most gross injustice that when a new district or parish Church is erected, the people should be required to pay for two parish Churches instead of supporting their own single Church, and I am thankful to find that in the bill proposed by Mr. Hubbard—and those who know him and his munificence to the Church, cannot doubt his loyal hearted attachment to it—this part of the question will not be lost sight of. That bill, I think, meets every objection, and our Church will greatly gain if the author can be spared to carry it through. I may, perhaps, remind you that in the select committee of the House of Lords, February, 1860, there was first recommended several alterations in the Church rate system. One was to give new districts and parishes the rates levied in them, and, of course, to exempt them from the mother Church. Another suggestion was, that Church rates should be recovered like poor rates. If these alterations were carried out (and both are provided for in Mr. Hubbard's bill), a great deal of the opposition to Church rates would be done away with. As to some of the objections urged against Church rates, I frankly confess, if we, as clergymen, met our parishioners as honest men, and would only argue the question with them, and place the issues fairly before them, it would be of great service, even in a mixed assembly. I have tried it where Radicals and Dissenters of all kinds were met together, and the general result has been that at the close of the meeting most of those who came to object were actually in our favour. I have had a meeting, for instance, where all in the parish for and against Church rates have come, those who oppose the rate being specially invited. Of course they have been asked to bring forward their arguments. One says, "Let everyone support his own." I say "Yes, I quite agree with you, and I ask you to support your Church because it is your own—it is your Parish Church." The man sees that he has a right in the Parish Church, and, as the law declares it to be the property of the parish, so it calls upon him in return to support that church and churchyard. The fairness of such an

argument as that will be, I believe, admitted by most Englishmen. Another man says, "But we do not go to the Parish Church." I reply, "Very likely; a man does not go to a gaol, but he pays for it." Another urges it is a matter of conscience. I know it is with many a money question, and I really hope Dissenters do not keep their consciences in their pockets. Besides, we have *our* consciences as well as *they*. A man pays, without opposition, his poor rates and his county rates, and chaplains—clergymen—are paid out of both. Yet, the man in these cases pays not only for a place of worship, but also for a clergyman for the rascals of the county, and buttons up his pockets and refuses to pay anything for a parochial building for the poor honest neighbours around him. I honestly say I cannot understand this. We, as Churchmen, conscientiously believe in the maintenance of the national Establishment; we, as Churchmen, are generally convinced that the union of Church and State is a scriptural union—that it was instituted in the earliest period, and that by God's blessing it will last to the end of time. And though, as individuals, we can each stand before God to be judged, we know we cannot be judged as nations hereafter. We only exist as nations in time, and therefore the only way we can, as a nation, uphold the worship of God, is by a national provision, such as we have in our Church rates. Therefore, whatever may be the specious forms proposed, or the appeals made to us, in order, for the sake of peace, to give up Church rates, I do think we in the Church of England ought to stand as one man and say, "They are the rights of the poor; they are the rights of the Church; and we will never surrender those rights." At the same time, I do think, in the altered state of circumstances, there must be some accommodation to them: and it is because in Mr. Hubbard's Church Rate Law Amendment Bill I find so many objections met, and that our position would be strengthened by increased support as to Church rates, I support it most earnestly. We are often taunted with being opposed to real liberty. I would ask anyone, Who are the true advocates of liberty? Those who would, as we do, submit to the plain principle that a majority shall rule? or those who, while professing such a love of voluntarism as to wish to extend it to everything, would force their voluntary principles upon us, and make us practice principles of which, to a great extent, we disapprove?

Mr. C. W. WILSHERE: I wish to bring before the meeting a scheme of legislation upon Church rates, which may commend itself to some who feel the unsatisfactory nature of the present state of the law on that subject, and who would be willing, for the sake of a permanent settlement, to consent to a modification of the principle on which the assessment is now made. Not to detain you by stating the grounds on which my proposal is based, which will be obvious on the slightest consideration of it, I proceed at once to give its broad outline: the details would not be difficult to fill up. Let returns be procured of the total value of the property throughout the kingdom subject to this liability, and of the gross amount of Church rate actually levied during the last fifty years. On these data let an average rate be computed which would have produced the same sum if annually imposed during that period in every parish: and in future let a rate of that amount be levied as a fixed and unvarying annual charge on all property which under the present law would be liable to Church rates. Suppose that 2d. in the £1, is the average arrived at; henceforth let this 2d. be paid, as one of the Queen's taxes, under a neutral designation, such as "fabric-rate," and the proceeds from each parish be handed over to the churchwardens, to be expended, subject to the control of the Archdeacon. So far we have only arrived at a small fixed payment regularly and compulsorily levied, instead of an intermittent impost, frequently a subject of contention, and too often grudgingly granted, if not positively refused. I wish particularly to ask the attention of those who are not such warm admirers of the present law as is the Venerable Archdeacon, to the remainder of the project. I have said that the proceeds of this "fabric rate" are to be handed by the collector to the churchwardens, who would account to the Bishop through the Archdeacon for its disposal, paying over to him any surplus for the requirements of more necessitous parishes. But I would give to every contributor to this new "fabric rate," a certain power of controlling the expenditure of it. If he objected to his quota being devoted to Church purposes, he should have the right of directing the collector to pay it over to the trustees of any duly registered places of worship within, say, five miles of his residence; his right to take part in parish vestries held for Church purposes remaining in abeyance during the period of such an alienation of his proportion of the rate. Such is the plan I have the honour to submit; it would preserve the principle of a rate for religious purposes, it would conciliate dissenters by conceding to them a right—not to repudiate a lawful liability, subject to which they obtained possession of their property, but to devote the share

of the tax levied on them to the maintenance of that lawful form of worship which commends itself to their conscience. They would not be slow to perceive the advantage of what would be, practically, to a certain extent, a regularly and equitably assessed Meeting-rate; and, when they return to the Church of their forefathers, they would bring back the rate with them. I have long wished to lay this proposal (which has privately met with much approval) before my fellow-churchmen, and I therefore greatly value the privilege of here addressing you, coupled as it is with that of having my plan submitted to so many thousands in the printed report of our proceedings. I shall esteem myself indeed fortunate, if I shall thus have contributed in any measure to the settlement on a just basis of this difficult and pressing question.

THE REV. J. FOXLEY: The address of the first speaker (which pained me very much) contained a reference to Church people as being clumsy. I think the way in which we go about our business in country parishes is a proof of this clumsiness. People think that Church rates do everything, and they are mistaken. We have a parish church, and were it not for church rates many parishioners would at least love the building in which they meet to consult. I was once talking with a Wesleyan Methodist about joining the Church, and he said, "It's all very well, but I do not see there is anything to join." He was about right. I have many excellent people in my parish—and I suppose that is an average one—but I do not find my people a living, organized body. There is a head, supposed to be my humble self; I have many helpers, and many of them help me very much, but there is no sort of idea among them they are to be gathered together as a living whole to do something: and until they have something to do they never will. With all deference to those who have wider experience, I certainly should like to see my people as it were thrown upon their backs and compelled to work. We should not then have people merely going to church, but Churchmen and Churchwomen with an interest in everything connected with us they now fail to feel. It is because Mr. White's plan seems to me to lead boldly into such a course that I, as a country clergyman, should like to see it carried out. I have two churches, one supported by a Church rate, the other not, and both places would be a great deal better if they had to work heartily together to support the church. In the one there is a church rate; in the other an endowment, and I should not mind giving up even the endowment if I could see the people obliged to maintain their own church.

MR. HENRY CLARK, of Liverpool: I express my regret that the four opening speakers have omitted all allusion to one point, which is the gist of the whole question, and which would prove an unfailing means of preserving Church rates. These rates, as with all other parochial rates, are levied in the interest and for the advantage of the entire parish, and those who pay them, pay them not only for themselves, but for those who cannot pay them. As with Church rates, so with highway rates, county rates, public garden rates, and free library rates—they are all levied upon the public indiscriminately, inasmuch as all are supposed to have an equal right to the full use of the institution for which they are levied. Unfortunately this principle of equal right of use has been lost in the case of parish churches, and here we are in the year 1866, wondering why the people of this country hesitate in paying rates levied expressly for their support. Herein has the Church erred. She has departed from her line of duty towards her most precious heritage, the poor, and is now reaping what she has sown. But the dawn of brighter things is being heralded. The claims of right, and of justice, and of duty, are at length listened to. During the last half-dozen years hundreds of district churches have been thrown open, and if our parish churches will do this, offering a loving welcome to *all*, throwing off the yoke of monopoly, which has been drying up our very life-blood, their claim for public support would be fully acknowledged. Depend upon it, Church rates can only be maintained by making the masses of our population first think they are getting something for their money, that the whole community are thereby benefited, and that, through the agency of the rates, the people of this land are becoming a more God-fearing and God-worshipping people.

MR. GRAYSTON: I only wish to say a few words at this late hour of the morning, but having had some little experience in parish matters, I thought I might add the result of my experience to what has been said. The difference between having a rate and none, I have felt keenly, for in our parish we have had our rate destroyed by the petty spite of half-a-dozen persons. The rate is a tax upon property or upon persons in respect of their property, which amounts to the same thing, and a person has no more right to rid himself of that burden than of the land or any other similar tax. If any scheme could be devised by which a person could invest a

certain amount in the funds to produce the rate it would do a great deal of good. No man has a right to rid himself of a Church rate, without providing the substitute. This discussion has shown to me very clearly the great mischief that falls upon a country when the legislature interferes with any good thing, because when you have once parted with a thing the great difficulty is to get any settlement of the question. I have been astonished at the great diversity of opinion amongst the members of the Church of England, who have spoken this morning. Some go for compromise, some for total abolition, some for a continuation of the present state of things. Now if we could bring the whole matter where it was before Government interfered with it, that would be the best thing to do. Not one single speaker this morning has shown that the question of Church rates was being felt as a grievance in the country. I consider those persons who give large sums of money to benevolent institutions and yet object to pay Church rates, are more inconsistent than I can describe; for if there is any institution in the world which loves order and consistency and charity, it is the Church of England. Take the Quakers—with all their benevolence,—they are the most uncompromising opponents of Church rates. They are exceedingly inconsistent people to do so. I think that the bill of Mr. Bovill, or of Mr. Hubbard, which embodies the same principles, would remove many of the difficulties at present in our path. No doubt our national honour and the position we have as a nation is due to our National Church, which shines like the sun to nourish and beautify the face of the whole country.

Alderman BENNETT, of Manchester: I cannot leave York without expressing my obligation to the Rev. Mr. White for the very valuable paper he has given to the section. There is nothing but the total and unconditional repeal of Church rates that will ever satisfy earnest Churchmen. In respect to our personal obligation to pay rates, just let us refer for a moment to what Church rates were in their origin. In olden time the repair of the fabric and the expense of conducting divine service lay upon the clergyman. When it came to be thrown upon the parishioners we cannot tell, but it was understood to be a payment for services received. Now, at this time of day, when more than half the people of this country, thanks to the Reformation perhaps, are no longer Churchmen, I hold that the time has passed when you can call upon the whole community to contribute for services which they decline to receive. The Church rate, as has been well expressed, is a personal tax, but a personal tax in respect of property. The way in which it was collected in respect of property was this:—Formerly the clergy required every man to contribute towards the services of the Church in respect to his property in the parish, or else he was excommunicated. His ability to pay was estimated by his holding in the parish. The tax was a personal one; nevertheless, his ability was measured by his property. A highway or poor rate can be recovered from a man's executors, but a Church rate dies with him. This proves the tax is a personal one. The remedies to recover Church rates are also personal. A defaulter is put into the Ecclesiastical Court, and in case of non-success, all that a judge can say is, "Sir, you are a bad man; you are excommunicated." But he cannot make him pay Church rates. I feel that I have a great deal more to say, but I am warned that my time has expired.

CONGRESS HALL. THURSDAY AFTERNOON.

COLLECTIVE MEETING.

His Grace the PRESIDENT in the Chair.

STATE AND PROSPECTS OF THE CHURCHES OF WESTERN EUROPE.

ARCHDEACON CHURTON READ THE FOLLOWING PAPER:—

THOSE who remember anything of the spirit of the French Journals and popular Literature from forty to fifty years ago, during the period which Frenchmen now call the Restoration, will bear witness what a singular change had then come over the minds of the people. They, who, a few years earlier, were only reading the histories of their great

campaigns under the first Empire, and fighting their battles over again, were now busy with religious controversy. Songs, novels, and caricatures were all employed in attacking the Home Missionaries, the associated 'Fathers of the Faith,' who were supposed to be Jesuits in disguise. And the assailed party were not idle in their defence:—a popular writer in the year 1825 complains that for some time past, the leading Articles in the Newspapers were like themes on questions proposed by the Sorbonne, and that the Editors, whose only Theology has been picked up from Horace or Corneille, now interwove their essays with grave sentences in the style of Sermons or Bishops' Charges, and talked of disengagement from the world, while they were reporting the price of Stocks. He ends with the apostrophe: "Ô Molière, come back from your tomb, and restore the cause of order!"

It is characteristic of the time and country, that the writer tells us in his title-page, that he was a Bishop retired from duty.¹

I was prepared to have taken a brief retrospect of the progress of the religious revival in France since this period, with some notice of the teachers and writers who have chiefly guided or influenced public opinion. But my reverend friend, who will follow me, will do it better, as he is better acquainted with many facts belonging to later years, and with the religious aspect of the present time in that country. I would also recommend,—and those who know the book will agree with me in recommending,—to all who wish for a little summary and just survey of this period, an instructive essay, published about six months ago, by M. Guizot, 'The Religious Re-awakening in France.' It is gratifying to find the old statesman and Christian historian and philosopher employing his vigorous old age in studies like those of our own noble exile, Clarendon, at Montpellier, each surveying the past scenes of their life and storms of state with calm impartiality, and giving lessons of truth for the benefit of ages that are yet to come. I learn also that the state of opinion in Italy will be reviewed by other accomplished speakers, and particularly by a noble Lord, the distinguished son of a distinguished father, whom we are proud to welcome to our Congress.

My remarks therefore will chiefly be directed towards Spain,—a country perhaps too little known or considered relatively to the question of religious progress. An old man's remarks will naturally have some regard to the past. There were two much-esteemed Yorkshire Clergymen, who were flourishing in the first quarter of the present century, Robert Darley Waddilove, for about forty years Dean of Ripon and Archdeacon of the East Riding, and Andrew Cheap, remembered with affectionate respect as Parish-Priest and Vicar of Knaresborough. Dean Waddilove in early life was chaplain to the Embassy at Madrid. Andrew Cheap, I think, was resident in the neighbourhood of Barcelona for two or three years about 1792, after Waddilove had returned to England. Some of the books and papers of these two clergymen have come to my hands, and have added something to my information about Spain.

There were two remarkable Spanish Ecclesiastics, with whom Andrew Cheap became acquainted in his youth during his sojourn in

(1) De Pradt. *Du Jesuitisme Ancien et Moderne*, Paris, 1825, p. 321.

that country. They were Felix Amát, and Felix Torres Amát, uncle and nephew, both natives of the province of Catalonia. Felix Amát was appointed in 1803 Confessor to King Charles IV, and Abbot of St. Ildefonso, the summer residence of the Court during the months when the heats of Madrid are scarcely tolerable. He was the author of a copious and learned Ecclesiastical History; and seems to have been indebted for his preferment to nothing but his learning and high personal character. He had been in early life much regarded by two excellent and beneficent Bishops, Joseph Climent, Bishop of Barcelona, and Francis Armana, Archbishop of Tarragona, men whose zeal and charity was manifested in doctrine and good works which are not yet forgotten. Torres Amát, the nephew, died Bishop of Astorga about the year 1843. He was a learned Hebrew and Greek scholar, and, by desire of Charles the Fourth, he undertook and completed, with most laudable care and patience, a Spanish translation of the Bible. Andrew Cheap recommended this Translation to the notice of our Society for promoting Christian Knowledge. Outliving his uncle, who died in 1821, he wrote his life, a most interesting piece of Ecclesiastical Biography; a copy of which he sent over to England about the year 1835 or 6, with an inscription in his own hand on the title-page, conveying his "affectionate remembrances to Senor Don Andres Cheap."

It is necessary to give a little sketch of the lives and character of these two well-deserving men; because other circumstances, which happened towards the close of the lives of both, bear very much upon the subject of this paper. Living in such eventful times, and in frequent attendance on the Court, Felix Amát found himself at Aranjuez in the memorable month of March, 1808, when the indignation of the people, on discovering that the Minister was duped and the realm betrayed, burst forth in violence against Manuel Godoy. It was night, and the other attendants on the Royal Family were afraid to venture out amidst a riotous mob, who were already within the great house which the favourite had built for himself, breaking the windows and smashing the furniture and chandeliers. Felix Amát undertook to go alone, accompanied only by a few servants with torches. By his faithfulness and courage he saved the life of the unfortunate Minister, who at that moment lay concealed in a garret. Time will not allow of entering into particulars: but the end was that Godoy escaped to France, where he died in obscure lodgings in Paris about forty-three years later, in October, 1851. The last notice of his family which I have met with is, that his grandson made his appearance at the Bankruptcy Court, in London, three years ago, in October, 1863.

After this crisis, and the captivity of the Spanish Bourbons, and the entrance of the intrusive King whom the Spaniards called Don Joseph, Amát remained at his post, cheerfully enduring the spoiling of his goods, and shunning no toil or effort by which he could mitigate the privations of other sufferers. It is not only the affectionate respect of his nephew, which gives him this character:—one of his fellow students in early life addressed him in elegiac verse with an easy play of words upon his name,

"Semper eris Felix, semper Amatus eris;"

and another independent witness, a few years after his death, calls him "a wise and virtuous man, an enduring honour to the Spanish Clergy, and worthy of a better fate than overtook him in the last ten years of his laborious career, years still consecrated in his retirement to the most unwearied study."¹

Now, what was this unworthy fate? It may be explained in a very few words. Felix Amát was a loyal Spaniard, a devout Spanish Catholic; but he was no Ultramontane. Seeing the danger to Religion itself from the claims of the Court of Rome and its continual conflicts with the Constitutionals in Spain, he wrote and published many letters to persuade Christian people to obey the laws and government of their country. He combated by name the views of certain Italian sophists on the Pope's temporal power; and he was equally explicit in opposing the latest famous champions of Ultramontaniam, that had appeared in France, the Abbé De la Mennais, Cardinal Bonald, and Count De Maistre. For all which services his writings were condemned to a place in the Roman Index; a compliment which was also paid in 1842 to the last Episcopal Charge of his nephew, Felix Torres Amát.

The Papal Court no longer deals in Interdicts; but the power wielded by the Congregation of the Index against Bishops and Clergy suspected of Gallicanism, or Espanolism, as it may be called on the other side of the Pyrenees, comes not far short of Excommunication. We may hope it is not about to be tried on some of our own countrymen, who have not quite divested themselves of old prejudices in favour of their country's laws. "I never met," says, Alexis de Tocqueville, "with an English Catholic, who did not value, as much as any Protestant, the free institutions of his country."² But what do we now hear of this wicked principle of "Nationalism?" It cannot be endured by any one who aims at the cardinal point in Ultramontane Theology.

It would be instructive, did the time and occasion allow, to reproduce in plain English the Spanish Correspondence, between the elder Amát, and the Roman Nuncio Giustiniani, on the subject of this overbearing censure. No one, I think, can read it without marking the strong contrast between the old Spanish gentleman, now of the age of seventy-four, and his calm and dignified defence, against the low insolence of the Italian—call him what you will.³

Contemporary with the elder Amát were two learned natives of the province of Valencia, Jayme and Joachim Villanueva. Their joint literary work was a 'Literary Journey to the Churches of Spain,' a work much of the same character as the '*Espana Sagrada*,' begun by one who has been aptly called the Spanish Dugdale, the learned and patient Henry Florez. A good antiquary learns to be a lover of his country. Joachim Villanuevn, the survivor of the two brothers, was this and something more. He was a zealous advocate of some much-needed reforms in the Spanish Church and State, and especially in the relations of the Spanish Church to Rome. He was a leading member of the Cortes, which sate at Cadiz in 1813, during the

(1) *Espana Sagrada*. Tom. xliiv. p. 8.

(2) De Tocqueville. *Mem. and Remains*, ii. 298.

(3) *Apologia Catholica de F. Amát*. Madr. 1843.

Peninsular War, the Assembly, which, influenced chiefly by his eloquent and forcible reasons, first decreed to abolish the Inquisition. Count Toreno, in his history of the Peninsular War, gives a striking picture of Villanueva's appearance in the Cortes, his grave and quiet irony, intermixed with occasional flashes of keener force, while "his pale face, his grey hair, and his tall and spare figure, re-called to mind the image of some old father of the wilderness."¹

After Ferdinand was restored, he was called to take a part in one or two of the liberal governments. By the last of these, in 1822, he was appointed Ambassador with full powers to the Court of Rome. Cardinal Gonsalvi refused to receive him. He had written a book, which had been proscribed in the Index. He was stopped on the frontier, and waited, while billets were interchanged, at Turin. In return, his own government, acting with some spirit, threatened to send home Monsignor Giustiniani. But as the governments in Spain rarely last very long, his friends were shortly thrown out; and, as he had once before suffered detention or imprisonment, when the Obstructives, or those whom they called in Spain 'the Medes and Persians,' were in power, he betook himself to Gibraltar, and determined to find refuge in England, which he calls in his Auto-biography "the native soil of Laws."² He was an old man; but he could employ himself in London in his banishment with translating into Spanish 'Paley's Natural Theology.' This translation was afterwards printed in Spain. He also had printed and published in London a short time before his death two volumes of what he calls his own 'Literary Life.' The first part is a retrospect of Spanish Literature in the reign of Charles III; but the greatest portion of the book is a history of matters in Church and State, in which he was concerned with his friends to the end of his public career. The number of projects entertained by eminent and able men in that country for some very important reforms both of doctrine and discipline, would surprise any reader who was not otherwise acquainted with the currents of Spanish opinion. Among others, a plan to bring that old incurable, the Roman Breviary, nearer to a primitive and scriptural form.

But the book is probably very scarce. Whether it is to be found in the Index, I cannot say. The writer naturally expected it would find its way to that distinction. I enquired for it shortly after its appearance; many years had passed before I obtained a copy. Villanueva was dead, and the Life had disappeared. It was traced to the hands of some Irish friends of the author, who appeared to have withdrawn it from circulation. There can be little doubt that they were acting under orders from Rome. It seems then not quite impossible to suppress a book by the agency of that authority, though the book has in its title-page the names of three or four respectable London booksellers, and was published when we were some way advanced into the Nineteenth Century. The last page of the Auto-biography is in the form of a very solemn charge to the respectable persons, by whom he expected the work to be denounced, to be careful in the name of truth how they dealt with it. After other very grave and earnest words, it concludes:

(1) *Historia de Espana*, III. 183.

(2) "La patria de las Leyes."

"Lastly, let them not lose sight of the nearness of the judgement-seat of God, before which many have already appeared, who, by their mean passions, or by their scarcely excusable ignorance, have placed in the Roman Index most pious treatises, of whose doctrine they might have profited for the good of their souls. It is probable that I myself may arrive first in the presence of that Judge; for I am on the verge of threescore years and ten:—or we may each appear together. It is a fearful thought, that I may then and there be the accuser of those whom I respect as my superiors in the hierarchical order of the Church." This is dated "London, July 20, 1825."

These sentiments have not ceased to animate later distinguished men among the Spanish Clergy. Testimony on this point is borne by Mr. Wallis, an American writer of intelligence a few years since; and the present Lord Clarendon, who was for some time our Ambassador in Spain, is reported to have declared in his place in Parliament, that during his residence in Madrid "he had heard in the Cortes from the lips of Spanish Prelates, sentiments of Christian charity as pure, and dictated by as entire a spirit of toleration," as he had ever heard in the English House of Lords.¹ It is not impossible he may have alluded, among others, to one whose words I shall shortly quote, the spirited and eloquent Martinez Velasco, Bishop of Malaga.

It is well known that, about twenty years ago, under the counsels of a statesman named Mendizabal, the Spanish Government, following the example of many other European States, suppressed the monastic institutions,—they did not suppress Sisterhoods,—and about the same time took into its own hands most of the Church's estates, providing that the Bishops and Clergy should be supported, as they are in France, by fixed stipends from the public funds. Probably by this change the very rich preferments, such as that of the Archbishopric of Toledo, which Townsend in the last century reckoned as worth £95,000 a year, have entirely disappeared; but I do not think the Spanish Bishops are cut down to the level of Bonaparte's maximum at the time of the Concordat, when the Archbishop of Paris was to have an annual allowance of £600. A statement in figures, which was drawn up a few years since, of Ecclesiastical Statistics in the Province of Zamora, gives one the impression, that, if stipends were regularly paid, it had not made ten per cent difference to the Clergy. The change seems to be in its principle much the same as has been in part effected nearer home by our Ecclesiastical Commission.

It was, however, a great change to make at once; and it excited many alarms. "The Medes and Persians," spread a report that the great financier, who had done it, was a Jew. Never, since the good old days of Peter the Cruel, had there been a Jew for Prime Minister. This slander was for a while current in this country; but it has been effectually refuted by a biographer of Mendizabal, Don Alfonso Tejero, who published his baptismal register, properly attested by the parish priest of Chielana, near Cadiz; by which it appears that he was not only baptized, but received at his baptism no fewer than seven Christian names.

But, for other reasons, the change was very unacceptable to the Court of Rome. Pope Pius VII., whom the Italians at one time

(1) S. T. Wallis. *Spain, her Institutions, &c.*, 1853, p. 285.

called "Bonaparte's Domestic Chaplain," had consented without much difficulty to Bonaparte's Stipendiary Bishops. But Gregory the Sixteenth was not in the same position with respect to Spain. It seems that the regulation then recognised, in the spirit of those old Concordats, which Villanueva calls "abortions of the Universal Monarchy of the Popes," was, that the Sovereign should appoint to all vacant Bishoprics within six months: if not, the Pope was to appoint. One may guess how this antiquated condition of things may have arisen in the Middle Ages, when the kings of different European States sometimes took into their own hands the property of rich vacant Sees, and delayed to fill them up. But if the Sovereigns did appoint, what then? The Bishops were to wait for the Pope's confirmation. How did this tell on the Church of Spain? Let us hear the words of the Bishop of Malaga, in the Cortes, at the close of the year 1837.

"At this actual time, a third part of the Bishoprics of Spain are vacant; and the Government, which is much too enlightened not to know that the orphanhood of the Churches is always no slight evil, has taken care to select for these Churches persons, whom it believes to be worthy of the public confidence, from their knowledge of ecclesiastical affairs, and their political regard to constitutional principles.

"The conduct of a certain Court, which unhappily for many ages has substituted the interest of its own See to the public interest of the Church, has placed obstacles and difficulties in the way, which up to this time it has been impossible to surmount:—it has refused to authorise these appointments. The need of such authorisation is a need, which ought never to have existed in the Church: it had no existence or beginning, till the ages of iron, of ignorance and despotism. The Court of Rome has refused to the Bishops selected by Her Majesty's Government their Bulls of Confirmation.

"It is no time now to dwell upon this evil,—the source of so many griefs, and the cause of so many calamities, which have afflicted the Church. But the Cortes will permit me to make one remark:—it is only this, that I have never met with any book, nor conversed with any person who could tell me, that St. Cyprian and St. Augustin, before they took possession of their Sees, were obliged to wait for Bulls of Confirmation."¹

It is obvious that the principle, asserted so forcibly by this sensible Prelate, once carried out, would break the "rotten parchment-bonds," which hold together that which one of our old Divines calls the "linsey-wolsey spiritual-temporal authority of the Pope" over other National Churches, and place the Spanish Church in the same position which ours attained at the Reformation. And may it not be said in a few words, that the whole history of the Churches in Western Europe since that period has been a history of struggles for that constitutional liberty, which we gained at once, by breaking a yoke, which neither we nor our fathers were able to bear? What were the Gallican Liberties, assented to with such unanimous public consent by the French clergy in 1682, but an assertion of this principle? What are

the many conflicts about intrusive Bulls and Briefs in Spain, Portugal, and even in Naples, but conflicts for the same principle?

Spain seems indeed at present to have exchanged King Log for King Stork;—the “Medes and Persians” have been succeeded by short-lived military despots, who seem to govern by courts martial. But when I read the lives and words of such men as I have named, and others who might be added to them, I cannot be without hope, that, as we remember when the beacon of liberty for Europe from wide-encroaching temporal tyranny was first kindled on those shores, so in some happier moment the country may awaken to a more full conviction, that in the Church, as in the spiritual life of man, Truth and Liberty are twin Sisters, and one will ever pine away, when a yoke is laid on the neck of the other.

There is this difference between Spain and France, that, while in Spain we have found the leading Bishops and Churchmen, Constitutionalists, in France they are Ultramontanes. Many in this enlightened audience will have learnt the causes of this difference from the writings of De Toqueville, Guizot, or Montalembert; and my reverend friend, who is about to address you, will illustrate it more fully. One obvious reason, no doubt, may be found in the distrustful treatment accorded by the French Governments to their Clergy. The people will not admit their Bishops to any share in the Councils of the State. This is perhaps not surprising, if they remember what mischievous and wretched Churchmen meddled with affairs of State under Louis XIV. and XV. But they keep them also nearly on the old Bonaparte allowance, which inspires them in regard to the State nearly with the temper of Crabbe’s “Sir Richard Munday” towards the parish-officers who took care of him in his childhood:—

“He kept in mind their bounty, and their blows.”

Consequently the Bishops of France, as a body, have certainly nothing of the vice of “Nationalism” about them:—they are, in that respect, all that a sympathiser on this side of the Channel could desire: that is, they make patriotism, or the love of their country, no part of their public duty. But as Bonaparte gave them uncontrolled jurisdiction over the inferior Clergy, in this particular, without much legal check, they make proof of their ministry.

But is there then no hope for spiritual liberty or just government in the Church of France? There is a distinction to be made. Discerning men have opposed the name of Gallicanism, as re-calling the age of absolute Monarchy in the State: but they have not meant to oppose the just exercise of the civil power in affairs of the church. Let me take the words of one of the most gifted and eloquent men who have appeared in France during the present century, the late Father Lacordaire: “The old Gallicanism,” he says, “is a piece of old lumber:—there is scarcely a breath left in it:—but there is an instinctive Gallicanism, which consists in a jealousy of any power without limits extending itself through the world over two-hundred millions of individuals. This kind of Gallicanism, is very much alive, and will make itself formidable; for it is founded on a natural, nay, on a Christian instinct.”¹ One must gladly hail such words from

(1) Montalembert, *Memoire de Lacordaire*, 190.

a man who had a remarkable influence on religious thought in his country: for this kind of Gallicanism seems not far from being first-cousin to Anglicanism; and there will be a rallying point of safety where it is maintained.

I must conclude with a burst of eloquence on the same subject from the same remarkable preacher, listened to by thousands a few years since in the metropolitan church of Notre Dame:—it may teach even ourselves a lesson of toleration.

“Whoever would except a single human being from the claim of right,—whoever would consent to the slavery of a single human being, white or black, or would unjustly bind even one hair of his head,—that man is not sincere, nor one who ought to do battle for the sacred cause of human kind. The public sense will ever reject the man who demands an exclusive liberty, or a liberty regardless of another’s right. Exclusive liberty is but a privilege; and liberty regardless of others is a kind of treason. But in the heart of an honest man, who speaks for all, and who in speaking for all seems sometimes to speak against himself,—in such a heart there is a law of power, of logical and moral superiority, which almost infallibly produces like for like. Yes, my Catholic hearers, if you wish liberty for yourselves, you must needs wish it for all men, and under all climes. If you demand it only for yourselves, your demand will never be allowed:—grant it where you are the masters, that it may be granted to you where you are the slaves.”¹

STATE AND PROSPECTS OF THE CHURCH IN FRANCE.

THE REV. FREDERICK GODFRAY, D.C.L. READ THE FOLLOWING PAPER:—

In offering a few remarks upon the “present state and prospects” of the Church in France—and to France I shall strictly confine myself—it may not be superfluous, *in limine*, to advert to a phenomenon manifested of late years, and which has exercised a prodigious influence upon the position of that Church—I allude to the sudden rise and spread of Ultramontanism. Thirty years ago the great majority of French ecclesiastics were Gallicans; now they are Ultramontanists. The resuscitation and development of ultramontanism has been generally attributed to the writings of Joseph de Maistre, de Bonald, and Lamennais, but another cause contributed to its introduction. Immediately after the Restoration of the Bourbons, the clergy, who during the Empire, had kept completely aloof from politics, constituted themselves into a powerful political party. Their recommendations to various political and civil offices always carried weight; and they became thoroughly confounded with an unpopular Government. Most unfortunately also they proclaimed themselves from

(1) Montalembert *ibid*, 249,250.

the pulpit partisans of absolutism, and introduced into their sermons violent denunciations of liberal principles; as some of their successors, after welcoming the last Revolution, and planting and blessing trees of liberty, hailed four years after the *coup-d'Etat* with delight, and then again have made by no means indistinct allusions to a modern Nero, a Diocletian, and even a Pontius Pilate.

When Louis Philippe ascended the throne, the clergy were prevented from interfering in the country's civil and political administration, and compelled to restrict themselves to their religious duties. This change had two most important results—the one beneficial and the other injurious. The clergy, being no longer patronized by and identified with an unpopular government, gradually regained some of the favour they had lost; but, on the other hand, fallen from their high estate, as they regarded it, by the fall of Charles X., and deprived of all political influence by the Revolution, they placed themselves in an extra-national and even anti-national position, turned to Rome for sympathy and support, and, instead of remaining Frenchmen and Catholics, as one of them has expressed it, they became Papists, and, in doing so, frequently left it doubtful whether they were any longer Frenchmen. The French Church, as M. de Montalembert himself acknowledged some years ago, and as M. Guizot has shown in his *Memoirs* and in his recently-published work, *Meditations on the present state of the Christian Religion*, made some progress in the time of Louis Philippe; possibly more real progress, in spite of the great material support afforded it by the present Government, than it has made since. But her complete subserviency to Rome and the importation of the extremest ultramontanist doctrines have proved most disastrous—a fact which I shall plentifully illustrate in the course of these remarks. This subserviency has deprived the clergy of the respect and esteem of many who are inclined to consider them rather as the servants of the Pope than Frenchmen, altered the character of the Gallican Church, obscured or defaced many of her distinctive lineaments, repelled the educated classes, transformed her from the Church of the nation into the Church of a party, or, rather, as the late great and good Bishop of Chartres expressed it, into “a cabal, full of acrimony and violence, which is established at Rome, and which has a large number of associates in France and in Italy.”¹

The Church in France, which before the first Revolution comprised 18 archbishoprics and 114 bishoprics, has now—exclusively of Algiers which forms part of the province of Aix, and of La Basse Terre, Saint Denis, and St. Pierre et Fort de France, included in that of Bordeaux—17 archbishops, and 69 bishops, who have under them some 765 canons, and 189 vicars general. The number of parish-priests is variously estimated at 45,000, 50,000, and 60,000. The bishops are provided with 231 ecclesiastical seminaries large and small. According to the decree of the 17th March, 1808, there ought to be a *Faculty of Catholic theology* attached to each metropolitan see, but only five have been established, namely, in Paris, at Lyons, Rouen, Aix, and Toulouse. In

(1) *Coup d'œil sur la Constitution de l'Eglise Catholique, et sur l'Etat présent de cette Religion dans notre France*, p. 5.

addition to these there are also four or five *Seminaries for foreign missions*.

The Protestants are divided into three categories—the Reformed, the Lutheran, and the Independent Churches, as the last call themselves. The Reformed, with their 105 consistories, have 1181 places of worship, 661 pastors, and a Faculty of theology at Montauban. The Protestants of the Augsburg Confession, with 44 consistories, have 431 places of worship, 303 pastors, and a Faculty of theology at Strasburg. The Free Churches have 195 places of worship and 98 pastors. There are, in theory, few doctrinal differences between these Protestant bodies; but Socinianism and Rationalism prevail widely among the Lutheran and Reformed, and especially among the former. Nevertheless Protestantism seems to be gaining ground in France. Twenty years ago Protestants amounted to about 900,000; they are now estimated at 1,500,000.

Coincident with the development and extension of Ultramontanism has been the multiplication of what are technically, but somewhat invidiously, called Religious communities. A distinguished Prelate at the Oxford Congress said he had “the very deepest objection in any way whatever to applying the word religious to such a life;” and he remarked that “the abuses of that life have come, first, from the promise of *perpetuity*, and, secondly, from the abuse connected with the admission of persons having *property*, and being led to give that property up in a moment of excitement to this purpose;” he added that “instead of the perpetual vow is representing the higher it is the admission of a lower standard.”

It is to be feared that great abuses and evils prevail in a large number of monastic establishments recently organized or revived in France; that many of their members have not entered them under the influence of any deep religious convictions, and that those convictions, such as they were, have not been deepened or improved by the adoption of the monastic life. The author of the *Maudit* has not drawn altogether on his imagination in giving an account of some of them. Let me read on this subject a passage from a letter which I received not long ago from one of the most learned priests in France. He says:—

“By the side of these young recruits, we find in ecclesiastical houses the scum of the parochial clergy; priests who have led a scandalous life, and obtain there a sure refuge against poverty. They assume some mystic name and are rigged out in some extravagant costume; they are charged to preach virtues they do not possess, truths in which they do not believe, devotions at which they laugh in their sleeve; and the simple folks, who would despise the scandalous parish priest, respectfully kiss the hand of the new Reverend Father. The bishops are glad to have monastic institutions in order to get rid of their bad parish priests.”

I would quote a passage from another letter received last week from a distinguished French dignitary. After saying that the Dominicans and Capuchins do some good, especially by preaching, the writer thus proceeds:—

“One cannot contemplate without anxiety other Religious orders multiplying on all sides, the utility of which is far from manifest,

and which amass money, one hardly knows how. Every year there spring up ten or twelve new Orders of women, with the most eccentric head-dresses and with the most outlandish costumes. Now, as during a long period Orders of women have existed to provide for all possible wants and miseries, I do not see the necessity of having religious women adorned in a variety of ways. The cause of the multitude of these institutions is simply this. A woman, who is not willing to pay the obedience she has promised, or to submit to the rules of the community she has joined, finds it more advantageous to leave that community, and to found a new one, of which she will *naturally* be perpetual Superior. To assist her in this important work, she wants a priest *bien placé* and enterprising. She will find one the more easily, as this priest will become, *naturally* also, the Superior general of this community. Thus it is that a new order is founded to gratify the ambition of two individuals, whose purpose it beautifully answers,—and without doubt the devil's also."

The Revolution of 1789 had abolished all religious Orders in France; it had abolished even those admirable Sisters of Charity who had done so much to relieve suffering, and those Benedictines who once rendered such signal services to religion and literature; and while, in other Roman Catholic countries, religious Orders have either been suppressed or have died a natural death, within the last few years they have been revived in France, have accumulated vast sums of money, and seem to be endowed with greater vitality than ever. According to the census of 1856 there were 64,393 men and women belonging to various Orders. Five years afterwards, however, the number was nearly doubled, there being 90,343 women and 17,776 men, living in 15,060 different establishments. These communities are sanctioned by the State, but there exist many others which are not authorized; and it seems that the number of those which are given in the official statistics is much under the mark. The Jesuits, for instance, are put down in the census tables as amounting to only 1085; but, according to a statement which has recently appeared in a journal published at Rome under the direction of the Society, the number of Jesuits in France is 2329, exclusive of some 700 French Jesuits living in other countries. Several of these Orders are looked upon with a good deal of jealousy, and not altogether illegitimate suspicion, by the Government. Some of them also, as has frequently been the case elsewhere, have manifested a violent impatience and intolerance of all episcopal control. The Cardinal Archbishop of Bordeaux said last year in the Senate that both the regular and secular clergy knew their duty towards their Bishops and would perform it; but both the Archbishop of Paris and his Vicar General had only a few weeks before been formally refused admittance into various Capuchin and Jesuit Convents and Chapels, which the Archbishop wished officially to visit. The superiors of these houses wrote to Rome and characterised the Archbishop's proceeding as "an act of rebellion against the authority of the Holy Father, and as showing a want of respect for the apostolical constitutions."

In spite of the unprecedented development of these and cognate establishments, it must not be supposed that Frenchmen generally

regard them with any special favour. Monastic institutions are looked upon with great aversion by most thoughtful and cultivated laymen, and even by many of the parochial clergy; and the "Regulars" in their turn look upon the secular clergy with something very much like contempt. "What shall I say," observed some years ago a pious and able layman, M. Bordas Demoulin, in a letter to Archbishop Sibour, "of the idolatry connected with so many practices, such, for instance, as those of the Sacred Heart? What shall I say of the polytheism—of the false worship of the saints who are equalled to God, and especially of the Blessed Virgin? What shall I say of that forest of superstitions which have sprung from monachism and the abuse of evangelical counsels? What paganism again!"

Not only is the old faith corrupted in these conventual institutions by creature worship and especially Mariolatry;—not only do they afford wide and dangerous latitude for all the eccentricities of excited imaginations and the exaggerations of morbid sentiment,—but some of them are promoters of disaffection and sedition.

By the side, however, of the strictly conventual institutions, which do little good, flourish many educational and eleemosynary communities which are of incalculable utility. Among these may be mentioned the *Œuvre de la propagation de la foi*, established in 1822 by two servant girls of Lyons, and which has now some 2,000,000 associates, and an income of 5,000,000 francs: the sisterhood of S. Vincent de Paul, which comprises some 18,000 members, and to which belonged the Sœur Rosalie; the *Petites Sœurs des Pauvres*, founded in 1840 at St. Servan by the Abbé Le Pailleur and Jeanne Jugan a domestic servant, and who receive into their houses or assist in their homes 20,000 aged men; the *Frères des Ecoles (Chrétienues)*, established nearly two hundred years ago by the excellent Jean Baptiste de la Salle; the *Congregation of Christian Instruction*, or, as it is more commonly called from the name of their founder (the brother of the celebrated writer), the *Frères Lamennais*, whose labours are chiefly, if not exclusively, confined to Brittany.¹ I should also mention the *Congregation of the Oratory*, founded in 1611 by the Cardinal de Bérulle, suppressed at the Revolution, and re-established in 1852 by the Abbé Pététot curé of St. Roch, and Father Gratry. Its members devote themselves to education, preaching, and theological science. It produced in former times Malebranche, Thomassin, Mascaron, and Massillon: and it has included among its members since its re-establishment some men who have distinguished themselves by their writings, such as M. Gratry himself and M. de Valroger.

This congregation is distinguished by these two remarkable peculiarities, which favourably contrast with those of many religious confraternities, societies, and communities in France and elsewhere. The members take no vows on their admission, and they respect episcopal authority. "Cardinal de Bérulle's immense love for the Church," says Bossuet, in his funeral oration on Father Bourgoing, the third Superior of the order, "suggested to him the thought of founding a society which should have no other spirit than that of the Church, no other rule than her canons, no other superiors

(1) See Guizot's *Méditations sur l'état actuel de la Religion Chrétienne*, and the *Manuel des Œuvres et Institutions de Charité de Paris*.

than her bishops, no other possessions than those of charity, no other solemn vows than those of Baptism and Ordination." Bossuet adds, as another essential characteristic of this institution, that the members of the Oratory resorted always to the Scriptures as the fountain head of truth, and were engaged in the constant study of them. Judging from the writings I have seen of some of the members, I should fear that this last excellent feature had become somewhat obscured since the re-establishment of the institution; and it is very significant that the name of the *Congregation of the Oratory*, or *Oratory of Jesus*, as it was designated by its original founder, has been recently transformed into *Oratory of the Immaculate Conception*.

The Protestants also possess a large number of societies and institutions having for object the propagation of Christian knowledge, the promotion of education, and the relief of suffering humanity; and in this respect they prove themselves worthy rivals of their Roman Catholic brethren. Indeed, considering the comparative paucity of their numbers, it is astonishing how many of these institutions flourish among them. They possess Biblical Societies, Missionary Societies, a Society for the Encouragement of Primary Instruction, a Religious Tract Society, and many others; and as the Roman Catholics have their "Society of the Catholic Half-penny," so the Protestants have their "Society of the Protestant Half-penny." The latter have also established at Sainte-Foy an agricultural colony and reformatory, which is analogous to the well-known and excellent establishment at Mettray. Neither should I omit to mention several orphanages, among which that at Saverdun, in the department of Ariège, occupies a high position; nor, least of all, the admirable Institution for Deaconesses in the Rue de Reuilly, which, though looked upon with no very generous feelings by cognate establishments in the Roman Church, seems to be organized and conducted on excellent principles, performs its work energetically and unobtrusively, and has elicited the warm commendation of more than one superior of some of our own sisterhoods.¹

French ultramontanes have frequently ridiculed the cumbrous and expensive machinery of our Ecclesiastical Courts, which I am not going to defend; and have made merry with the expenses incurred by our bishops in prosecuting delinquent priests. It must be allowed that French bishops manage these matters far more cheaply and expeditiously than ours; though whether it be for the interests of the Church is another question. Ecclesiastical Courts no longer exist in France; and the inferior clergy are entirely in the hands of their ecclesiastical superiors. When the first Consul re-established religion, he did not restore the Church's property; and since that time the clergy have been paid by the State. But, as De Tocqueville remarks, this was not the only blow given to their independence. Before the Revolution there was in each diocese an ecclesiastical tribunal called the *Officialité*. Napoleon abolished that tribunal, and left the inferior clergy entirely dependent upon the Bishops, from whose decision there is practically no appeal, for it

(1) See Triqueti's *Exposé des Œuvres de la Charité Protestante en France*.

would be absurd to consider appeals to the Metropolitan, or to the Pope, as of any utility. An appeal certainly lies to the Council of State against any abuse of power on the part of the ecclesiastical authorities, and this is called *Appel comme d'abus*. In former times these appeals came before the Parliament or the King's Council; but by the Concordat of 1801 they were transferred to the Council of State. A law passed on the 8th April of the following year, and prescribing the formalities to be gone through, is still in force; but such appeals are seldom made, and, when they are, the results are not worth the trouble. Napoleon I. concentrated all authority in the hands of the Bishop, believing that his own power would always be supreme over the bishops, and that, master of the bishops, he would at the same time be master of all the clergy; but matters have turned out very differently from what he anticipated. At any rate, whatever may have been the case in his time, his arrangements, which were intended to strengthen imperial authority and to consecrate despotic power, have turned out most unfortunate for his nephew. By a remarkable retribution the present Emperor has frequently encountered the most violent opposition, and sometimes open hostility, from the ultramontanist bishops, who make use of their clergy as instruments against himself.

The command of the bishops over their clergy, beneficed or unbeneficed, is absolute, as the seven or eight hundred unfortunate interdicted priests to be found in Paris alone, engaged in all sorts of menial occupations, have too much reason to know. Even the *curés inamovibles*, of whom there are 4517, can be removed at any time and ruined. This has been the lot within the last few years of several well-known and high-principled ecclesiastics, whose only offence is that they protested against a destructive ultramontanism, or advocated the free circulation of the Scriptures, or denounced such dogmas as that of the Immaculate Conception, which a large number of the clergy passively repudiate, or such mountebank and impious absurdities as those of Madlle. de Lamerlière at La Salette. But while the maintenance of Gallican opinions, even in their mildest form, and the denunciation of acknowledged and demonstrated impostures, are thus severely punished, far more serious offences are frequently overlooked.

In an interesting paper in one of our leading Quarterlies, an eminent clergyman, recently deceased, said three years ago with reference to the French Church:—"There the chapter is a real, moving, living power; a power without which the bishop cannot act, and which, therefore, on the whole—whatever may be his peculiar tenets—keeps him pretty much to the general expression of the faith." This is a complete mistake. I showed the article last year to a friend—a distinguished member of the Institute, a Roman Catholic, and a very religious man; and he appended the following note to the passage in question:—"That is quite incorrect. The bishop is now-a-days a true despot, and never consults the canons of his Cathedral; or, if he consults them, it is only *pro formâ*."

A charge has frequently been brought against the Church of Rome of uniformly either forbidding or discouraging the indiscriminate and free circulation of the Word of God, as not only useless, but

even dangerous and injurious for the laity. At the great meeting of the "National Society for a new translation of the Holy Scriptures into French," held at the Sorbonne on the 21st March last, and attended by a large number of Senators, Members of the Institute, Professors of the University, Roman Catholic Clergymen, Protestant Pastors, and others, Canon Bertrand of Versailles delivered an admirable speech, in which occurred the following passages:

"It is a prejudice to believe that the reading of the Bible can produce no good among persons of little instruction, that it is even dangerous for some. I will not here discuss the question under any theoretical point of view; allow me only, gentlemen, to adduce a simple fact. I was for twenty years at the head of a rural parish [Herblay] of some importance. Now, this parish, consisting almost exclusively of agricultural labourers, was indisputably one of the most religious in the neighbourhood of Paris, notwithstanding the daily intercourse of the people with the capital. One day I was congratulating myself on this state of things, in the presence of an eminent member of the Central Consistory of Paris. 'Might it not be,' said he, 'that your parish was formerly Protestant?' 'Not at all,' I replied; 'its inhabitants, on the contrary, were of the party of the League.' I am not come here, gentlemen, to inquire into the causes of this happy exception of a Christian parish in the midst of irreligious districts. I shall be content with informing you that almost every family had a Bible, which was read aloud in the winter evenings. I have asked myself whether this was not the secret of the preservation of the faith in that parish. Indeed, we read in Isaiah lv. 11, *So shall my Word be that goeth forth out of My mouth, it shall not return unto Me void.* The Word of God is therefore fruitful of itself."

Although the society had been approved of by the Archbishop of Paris, it was, at the instigation of the Nuncio, at once assailed with the most vehement hostility by the ultramontanist journals, and by many of the most advanced ultramontanist Bishops, some of whom seemed influenced by the clamorous importunities of the journals; and several of the clergy of Paris, men of high standing, were compelled to withdraw. I do not know whether the Bishop of Versailles also anathematized the society, but some of his organs grossly attacked M. Bertrand, and the bishop himself called upon the canon to leave it on pain of interdiction if he disobeyed, and to retract those particular passages in his speech which I have been reading, and which Mgr. Mabile considered as most reprehensible. Canon Bertrand has withdrawn from the society, but declined to retract the obnoxious words, and, what is more, has not the remotest intention of doing so. There the matter rests at present. Had Canon Bertrand been an obscure priest, it is but too probable that he would before now have been suspended and ruined. But he is a man of high intellectual and literary eminence, of irreproachable character, and of great learning; he is a man who would have been an honour to the French Church in her palmiest days, and who is therefore a great honour to her now when she possesses so few eminent men; he is, moreover, an elderly man, and it is possible that the fear of additional scandals, which are not uncommon in the Diocese

of Versailles, if not a sense of justice and honour, may induce Mgr. Mabille to let the matter drop. With reference to the society for the translation of the Scriptures into French, the Nuncio and the Ultramontanists have had enough influence to bring about its dissolution; but I hear on good authority that it will probably soon be reconstituted under the immediate auspices of the high principled and able Archbishop of Paris. The Bible is unfortunately little known in France; travellers frequently meet with intelligent and educated Frenchmen, who are ignorant of those prominent facts in Scripture History with which children in our national schools are well acquainted; and it is very probable, as significantly intimated by Canon Bertrand, that ignorance of the Bible may account for the irreligion and practical heathenism which pervade a large portion of the community.

I shall say nothing about the large number of interdicted priests in France, the number of whom, in Paris alone, as given in Convocation by the Bishop of Oxford, was probably, actually under the mark. Time also forbids my touching upon the income of the French Clergy, in estimating which the *casuel* (surplice fees), which last year, in the single diocese of Paris, amounted to some seven millions of francs, is too frequently overlooked. I must, however, say a few words about the ecclesiastical seminaries. The Council of Trent ordained that every bishop should have near his house an ecclesiastical Seminary, where children of twelve years and upwards should be prepared for the ministry. This order was repeated in the Ordinance of Blois, 1579; and soon afterwards these institutions were established in every French see. The ecclesiastical seminaries—two, at least, of which now exist in every diocese—are under the immediate and absolute control of the bishop, who names the principal and all the professors. Some of the pupils pay a little towards their education, but others are educated gratuitously. Nearly all these seminaries, I believe, receive pecuniary assistance from Government, and whatever deficit there may be is made up by collections and appeals to private charity. Formerly, members of the best families in France received holy orders, but now the ranks of the ministry are almost exclusively recruited from the lowest classes. The great majority of the parochial clergy are the sons of peasants and artisans; and it is to be feared the training they receive both in the small and large seminaries is scarcely calculated to counterbalance whatever disadvantages they may labour under from their family origin and its associations, and which frequently accompany them throughout life. The Bishop of Ely observed at the Oxford Congress that “if ever we draw a broad line of separation between our divines and our men of science and literature, educate one body at the Universities and the other body elsewhere, we shall surely find the former narrow and bigoted, the latter sceptical and irreligious.” The system pursued in the French ecclesiastical seminaries affords evidence of the truth of this remark as regards candidates for orders: it dwarfs and contracts their intellect, renders them narrow-minded and bigoted, and excludes them from all sympathy with men and things around them; while the separation in which they live from the rest of the world—a separation which is perpetuated by their subsequent enforced celibacy—prevents them from exercising their legitimate influence

upon the mass of the community, and becomes most injurious to themselves. I have frequently heard educated and religious Frenchmen condemn, in very strong terms, the system of moral and mental training pursued in their ecclesiastical seminaries, and contrast that training and the general position of their own clergy with those of the clergy of our own Church, who, by birth, education, and position, are, generally speaking, fitted for the highest and lowest offices, and able to associate with the most intellectual and aristocratic orders as with the humblest classes. This is not the opinion of laymen only. Roman Catholic ecclesiastics, French and German, of the highest eminence, deplore the evils inherent to those ecclesiastical seminaries, and the want of central schools of theology.

Thus Döllinger, in his address on "The Past and Present of Catholic Theology," after saying that "much better things may fortunately be said of France" than of Italy, and mentioning a few distinguished French clergymen, namely Gerbet, Maret, Lacordaire, Gratry, Bautain, Dupanloup, Ravignan, and Félix, three of whom by the way are dead, while one has been silenced and perhaps disgraced, and another excluded from the bishopric to which he had been nominated by the Emperor, goes on to observe:—

"Where are there in France the true theologians, the equals and followers of Petau, and Bossuet, and Arnauld? Where the men of fundamental and comprehensive learning? There is no answer. France has no theologians, because she has no high school of theology, not one school even which teaches the theological sciences. But things will not remain thus much longer. . . . There is increasing anxiety that the French clergy will be driven more and more out of the bosom of society and national life, will be forced more and more into an isolated and caste-like portion, and will forfeit more and more its influence on the male parts of the population, which has already been so much weakened."³

Four years ago I received a letter from a learned French Abbé, which contained these words:—

"I do not exaggerate when I say that the worst portion of the population is that which has received the false education of the small seminaries, and which has not pursued its ecclesiastical career. Instead of developing the truly Christian character in those young souls, the teaching there given has developed only their sentimentality. . . . It is not too much to say that these establishments materially contribute to bring about those social disorders, that incredulity, that indifference, that scepticism, that practical atheism which corrupt society in Roman Catholic countries, and which pave the way for frightful catastrophes."

This is strong language, but I have heard other French clergymen say the same thing; and it certainly is a remarkable fact that many of the writers of the present time, such, for instance, as Proudhon, Constant, Peyrat, and Renan, who have obtained notoriety for their infidelity and blasphemies, have been educated in these seminaries, and, some of them at least, received holy orders.

(3) Quoted in the *Quarterly Review* for October, 1865.

A high authority has recently said that Liguori is better adapted for Italy than England. It seems however to have lately become marvellously adapted for France. During many years Bailly's *Manual of Dogmatic and Moral Theology*, and Lequeux's *Manual of Canon Law*, had been used as standard works in all the seminaries; but now, through the influence of the Ultramontanists, they are excluded, and have been condemned by Rome as Gallican and "pernicious;" and Liguori has taken the place of Bailly as a text book.

In 1826 seventy French Bishops declared that they adhered to the four celebrated propositions, passed in 1682, by the assembly of the clergy of France, under the guidance of Bossuet. I do not know how many French Bishops adhere to them now; but they are scorned and derided by the dominant faction. They are repudiated in all the seminaries, and in most of these institutions the very reverse is inculcated. In fact the learned writer of the clever series of letters in defence of the Lyons Liturgy, published under the name of *Sophronius*, and whom I am proud to call my friend, tells us that, in the estimation of Ultramontanists, Gallicanism and heresy are convertible terms. Neither does Bossuet himself meet with a better fate than the declaration of 1682, or than Gallicanism. A writer in the *Quarterly* told us a year ago that, when once arguing with a distinguished French ecclesiastic, he was met, on quoting Bossuet, with a shrug of the shoulders, and an assurance that the great Eagle of Meaux was himself "almost a heretic;" but Bossuet has been called an actual heretic more than once. At the provincial council of La Rochelle, some twelve or fourteen years ago, several members proposed that a formal censure should be passed on Bossuet; while the author of a work, which has received the *imprimatur* of three French Bishops, has drawn an ingenious comparison between Bossuet and Voltaire, and laboured to prove that Voltaire was a disciple of Bossuet, and was trained and formed by Bossuet. A long tirade against Bossuet in a work which possesses no other claims to notice and distinction, obtained a few years ago for its author—a French Bishop—a Cardinal's hat.

Two or three features in the organization and system of the Church in France are worthy of the attention and imitation of our own Church. With a population of 36,000,000, France possesses, exclusively of the colonial sees, no less than eighty-six bishoprics: England and Wales, with a population of some 21,000,000 or 22,000,000, comprise only twenty-eight. French dioceses are conterminous with French departments: why should not English dioceses, as a general rule, be conterminous with English counties? The subdivision of English sees and multiplication of Bishops would be fraught with the most beneficial results to the whole community. It would bring the Bishops into more frequent and intimate relations with their clergy, and would enable them to hold those private and public conferences with them, which would serve as a powerful encouragement and stimulant to the labours of the latter: it would provide, as is the case in France, for the annual administration of Confirmation throughout our towns and villages, the beneficial effects of which, both retrospectively and prospectively, would be felt far and wide; it would, in short, as it has been well said by a high authority, diffuse,

as from a living centre, to every parish and household in the diocese, those spiritual gifts and graces which the Great Head of the Church bestows by means of the Episcopate.

Again, as each French see is provided with its one or two ecclesiastical seminaries, so each English Bishop should have a properly organized Theological College, not, as is unfortunately the case among our French neighbours, as a substitute for, but as supplementary to our universities. We have already a few of these, but each Cathedral town should be provided with one, in which, after having finished his academical course, every candidate for orders should spend a twelve-month or so, and undergo a definite and systematic training for the various departments and functions of the ministry.

In connection with one special and most important duty of the Christian ministry, I would venture to mention another point in which we might also advantageously follow the example of our neighbours. It was said a few years ago, if I recollect rightly, by the great English Prelate whom I have already mentioned, that the Clergy of the Church of England were, in point of high moral tone, education, learning, physical and intellectual activity, and practical usefulness, superior to the Clergy of any other Church in Christendom; and I believe the remark was perfectly just. In one respect, however, I think they are inferior—I mean in the *delivery* of sermons. Though the French Church still possesses a few good preachers who attract great crowds, as, for instance, Father Félix, Father Hyacinthe, and the Bishop of Orléans, still the same decline has come upon the pulpit which has befallen other departments of the French ecclesiastical system. French sermons are, as a whole, very poor, and not very original; and those who are at all familiar with the great preachers of the seventeenth century, and with others not so celebrated, such, for example, as the Père Lejeune will frequently recognize, in sermons they hear in churches in France, passages with which they are well acquainted; but then most of these sermons, such as they are, are admirably delivered. Now, it is just the reverse with ourselves. English sermons are, as a whole, much better than French ones, but then many of them are badly delivered; and the causes of the difference are obvious. Pulpit oratory is systematically studied and practised among our neighbours, and, as the Bishop of Exeter has remarked, “disgracefully neglected” among ourselves.

All who are at all acquainted with France, know how the large majority of educated Frenchmen are estranged from the Church; and there can be no doubt that the corruptions both in doctrine and practice, which, under ultramontanist influence, now pervade the French Church, and are presented as integral parts of Christianity, have powerfully contributed to the spread of indifference and infidelity. The lamented Archbishop Affre once said: “Should ultramontanist doctrines triumph in the religious world, they would induce people who are Catholics to abandon Catholicism, and would prevent non-Catholics from becoming Catholics;” and the actual condition of more than one Roman Catholic country bears abundant testimony to the truth of his words. As regards France, the promulgation of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception and the general prevalence of Mariolatry, in its most exaggerated form; and

such impostures as those of La Salette and Lourdes, which are too frequently put on a par with the miracles of Christianity, and in which the same credence is demanded, have in particular repelled multitudes of thinking men from religion, and sometimes even placed them in direct antagonism to it. French Bishops are constantly repeating in charges, pastoral letters, and sermons, that infidelity and immorality are greatly on the increase in the country; that there is a complete estrangement between religion and literature—and we scarcely need their assurances to that effect; but this portentous fact suggests a very important question—What does the Church do to check or neutralize this infidelity and immorality? An eminent English writer has lately observed that while the work of M. Renan achieved such an enormous popularity in France, nearly the entire English press condemned it; and even those organs that might be supposed to sympathise with the author's general conclusion, showed themselves far too perspicacious to confound his romance with history. Doubtless other works against the Faith which have recently appeared in this country have attained a wide circulation, but these works have called on all sides a host of such answers as no other country than England could produce. But what is the case in France? Materialist, positivist, rationalist, immoral, and infidel principles pervade the great mass of its literature; books against Christianity are constantly appearing, but few or no answers are made to them. Father Gratry and others have replied to Renan, but by far the best replies his book has received are those, not of Roman Catholics, but of one of the profoundest thinkers, eloquent orators, and learned and philosophical writers of modern times—the Protestant Guizot, of the Abbé Guettée, who has joined the Russo-Greek Church, and of M. de Pressencé, the Protestant Pastor.

M. Guizot said only last April:—

“I regard with very complex and very perplexing feelings the present condition of my country and of my age, its intellectual and moral, as well as its social and political condition. My soul is full at the same time of confidence and of disquietude, of hope and of alarm. For good and for evil, the crisis through which the civilized world is passing, is infinitely more serious than our forefathers had foreseen, more serious than we ourselves consider it, we who have already experienced its various consequences. Sublime truths and excellent principles are mixed up with ideas essentially false and perverse. A noble work of progress and a hideous work of destruction are simultaneously carried on in the minds of men, and in society.”¹

But whatever evils may beset the French Church, there are still signs of hope. In spite of the persistent and systematic endeavours to crush Gallicanism, it must not be supposed that it is dead yet, as its enemies loudly but insincerely proclaim it to be. “Almost all our old bishops,” said a distinguished judge and senator, M. Bonjean, in the French Senate last year, “almost all our old curés were sincere Gallicans; and, God be praised, there are still *many* left. But they remain quiet, while the Ultramontanists raise their voice and possess noisy organs; they remain quiet, because alongside them a power has

(1) Preface to *Méditations*, pp. x. xi.

placed itself with which they are compelled to live at peace." The crowds who flocked to the Sorbonne on the 21st of March last, at the meeting of the Society for the translation of the Bible, and the character of the speeches there delivered by Gallican priests and laymen, especially those of Canon Bertrand, of the Abbé Martin de Noirlieu, the venerable curé of St. Louis d'Antin, and of the Abbé Loyson, brother of the eloquent Father Hyacinthe, and assistant curate of St. Clotilde, who stigmatized the Inquisition and every species of tyranny imposed upon the conscience, and the publication of whose speech the Ultramontanists managed to prevent, are significant facts. Equally significant is it that the author of the famous letters in defence of the Gallican Liturgy should have obtained the sympathy of nineteen-twentieths of the Clergy of the Diocese to which he belongs. Equally significant is it that at the provincial council of Paris, under Archbishop Sibour, priests should have petitioned for the restoration of the cup to the laity. Equally significant is it that the present Archbishop should be willing to take under his immediate patronage a Society for the translation of the Bible into French. Equally significant is it that the same Prelate should have said in his Pastoral Letter of the 15th August last, "Children of the Church, we shall seek in the solemnity of the Assumption both the motives and the occasion to honour the prerogatives of the Virgin Mary; to bring down upon us the loving and powerful protection of the Mother of God, who is also our mother, and to imitate the virtues of our *sister*, who, *born of Adam like ourselves*, now reigns in heaven, which is reached by the two ways afforded unto man, *grace and liberty*." The last words are regarded as a sort of protest against the Immaculate Conception. Still Ultramontanists largely predominate, and few of the Clergy are bold enough to call themselves Gallicans. On several occasions when priests slightly tinged with Gallicanism have been nominated to Bishoprics, the Pope has thrown difficulties to the way of their appointment, and, in the instance of one learned and avowed Gallican, prevented the appointment from being made at all.

It has been recently stated that the Pope and his cardinals had determined to hand over Rome to Napoleon as the successor of Charlemagne, and to appoint him vice-gerent of the Roman Church. Doubtless such a course would be most convenient just at present for one of the parties, but it would not be equally convenient for the other, who is now in a fair way of being extricated from the difficulties of the Roman question, and who would scarcely desire to have them replaced on his shoulders in an aggravated form. Indeed, it is the opinion of many that a breach between Napoleon and the Papacy is not far distant. It is said that the French Government has been for some time utterly weary of the pretensions of the Poppedom, and of its interference with the ecclesiastical and temporal affairs of France, of its denunciations of freedom of conscience, progress, and enlightenment, of its summoning the French Bishops to Rome, ostensibly to canonize Japanese martyrs, but in reality to deliver violent tirades against French institutions and the rights and independence of nations. If this breach take place, it may lead to a reformation of the Church in France. It is apparently the only way of safety for the once famous Gallican Church.

DISCUSSION.

The Rev. F. MEYRICK: I propose to confine myself to one country, in the same way as my friends, who have preceded me, have done. I speak only of Italy, and there is so much to be said of it at the present moment, that I shall not be able to enter into any historical account of what *has* taken place. I desire to bring before you the *present* phase of religious thought in Italy, in order that we may see whether we may not do something there, for that is the conclusion I wish to draw. One preliminary caution I wish to make. I ask you not to suppose that I approve or disapprove of anything in the great political or ecclesiastical movement which is going on in Italy similar to ours of the 16th century unless I express approbation or disapprobation. In such a movement it is likely that things, partly right and partly wrong, would take place, and it is impossible, in fifteen minutes, to stop and say how much I approve of and how much otherwise. What I wish particularly now to show is that there is a strong reforming spirit in Italy, and the way in which the great work is being carried out. First then I will state that the present ultramontane Church, as such, has lost its hold upon the population of Italy. One fact is sufficient upon this point. There is a man in Italy who almost, in himself, is a representative of the country. He is regarded by Italians in the same way as the Duke of Wellington was regarded by Englishmen formerly. He is worshipped by them. I mean Garibaldi. A few weeks ago in the Royal City of Florence the population came together in thousands to hear some words from that great man. He came out and spoke. First, he gave them some advice as to the army and the approaching elections, and then he said, "I have one word more to say to you—have nothing to do with the priests." Somebody then cried out in the crowd, "Death to the priests." "No," he said, "death to none; that is what the weak would do, not the strong; but have nothing to do with them." And the crowd shouted, "We will have nothing to do with them." I merely bring this forward to show you that the priests who attach themselves to the Roman Curia have lost their power over the people of Italy. With this spirit there is growing up a strong desire for reformation. This shows itself both outside and inside the Church. There is a strong body of persons who have formed themselves into dissenting communities in Italy. They consist of Waldenses, Wesleyans, and others. For myself, I cannot but rejoice when any single soul frees itself from the meshes of the Papal system. Notwithstanding, I cannot sympathize with this movement as a movement, because, in the end, it would result only in a few dissenting congregations being spread throughout Italy. Ours is a nobler hope, a greater thought than that: we want to see the Church of Italy a reformed Church, as England reformed its Church. I will say no more then of that movement which is external to the National Church, but I would specially ask your attention to the internal movement that is going on. It is a struggle between the Roman Court on the one side, and the will of the people and Church on the other. Within the Italian Church itself, there are men who desire to reform themselves upon primitive principles. They desire to do as we did in the 16th century. Their creeds are the Nicene, the Apostles, the Athanasian. They wish for our discipline—the government of the Church by Archbishops, Bishops, Priests and Deacons, deans and canons, and everything connected with the system of a hierarchy. They say, "We want to rid ourselves of the superincumbent weight of the Papacy, and to come forth as a free Catholic reformed Church." What are the events that have especially happened during the last year with regard to this party? They are events that have increased their hopes and given them a strength they never had before. I will enumerate one or two political facts that have had this tendency. The first is the cession of Venetia. The idea that has long been before the Italian mind is that they would be one nation, one power. There have been two things opposing them. Venetia and Rome distracted their eyes; but now, no more. Venetia has become a part of the Italian kingdom, and now there remains only Rome, and it is there, consequently, that the eyes of all patriotic Italians are turned. Besides, during the late war so many priests were found to have had dealings with the enemy, that the animosity of the national feeling against the Roman Curia has increased tenfold. Next, I will mention the bill that has lately been passed for the suppression of monasteries. We may either kindly, or contemptuously look upon those who talk about monasteries elsewhere; but, in point of fact, in countries where they

exist, their inmates are known to be the sworn soldiers of the Court of Rome against the authority of the national Church. It has been decided that the monasteries of Italy shall be suppressed; and here, there is a great step taken by the patriotic party in their march towards the reformation of their Church. Then, there is another thing. It is proposed that the Bishoprics of Italy shall be diminished. There are no less than 230 at present. I desire, above all things in England, to see an increase in the episcopacy. I should be glad to see a very large increase here, and I should like to see the disproportion which exists between foreign churches and our own altered by an increase here, rather than a decrease there. But let us recollect this;—there is coming an œcumenical council of the whole Church of Christ. When that comes there will be at least this good arising from the diminution of the numbers of the Italian Sees—there will not happen what happened at the Council of Trent—all the rest of the episcopate of Europe and the world will not be swamped, and far more than swamped; by the episcopate of the one country of Italy. Then, I wish to speak of another thing—the accession of Ricasoli to be Prime Minister in Italy. There is not a statesman in Italy who knows what the Italians want, or their need of a national independent Church, as Ricasoli does. He has long since said that the freedom of the State in Italy never can be perfect until there is an independent Church as well as an independent nation. And it is said to be his intention to introduce two bills, one to prevent all oaths of vassalage which are now taken by the Bishops of Italy to the Pope of Rome; and another, to fill all the vacant sees without waiting for the confirmation of the Pope. When this is done, a National Church will be constituted. One thing more of this kind I wish to mention—the recent quarrel between Cardinal D'Andrea and the Pope. The Cardinal, simply because he has taken the liberal side in politics, has been suspended from exercising his functions as Bishop of Sabina; he has published an appeal saying he will never submit to this; he appeals from the Pope to the Pope better informed; he reminds his Holiness that his Holiness is only a *confratello*, a brother and an equal with other Bishops; that Bishops are not appointed by man, but by the grace of the Holy Spirit; that there is no spiritual authority higher than that of Bishops; and that, therefore, he will not submit to an interdict. Now, I say it is very possible we may see in Cardinal D'Andrea—for I know he is prepared to go further, if, as is likely, they may now seek to deprive him of his cardinal's hat—I say we may see in him the Granmer of the Italian Church. And now, what have we to do with this? As in politics, there are two principles by which statesmen are affected—Order and Liberty, so Churchmen are affected by the love of Truth and the love of Unity. How are these to be attained? Some are so carried away by a love of Unity that they would give up Truth and bow down to the Pope; on the other side, there are some who so love Truth that they trample upon and despise Order. We will have neither of these. I say that no Unity is to be attained except through the Unity of Truth; no Truth is to be attained except in connection and conjunction with Order. Then, I say, do not, on the one side, make any compromise with the Papal system; and, on the other, do not attempt to set up Dissenting congregations nor a Free Church. Do not attempt to set up a Free Churches in other countries, but try to remedy the evils in the present organizations; try to reform the evils within the Italian Church, and we may live to see it joined with the Church of England as a sister Church on the scriptural basis of Evangelical doctrine and Apostolic order, and in the bands of Catholic love.

THE EARL OF HARROWBY, K.G.: A few months ago it was proposed to me, having taken some interest in Italy and its church, that I should produce a paper at this Congress. Happily, for you, I declined the invitation, and the duty has fallen into the hands of Mr. Meyrick, who has given you a most exhaustive address. I confess I always approach this subject with fear and trembling, for I do think it is a very awful thing to touch the religious convictions of other countries. Whatever our feelings may be, in such a case, we are working with unknown materials, and are engaged in an undertaking in which we have not the elements at our command. It is difficult enough in England to uproot, to change, or to construct, but when we deal with foreign countries, all the difficulties are multiplied ten-fold; therefore, I confess I do approach the subject of this reforming movement in Italy, and the share which we may in any way take in guiding it, with peculiar apprehension. It is impossible anyone can have been conversant with Italy without knowing that if there are corruptions in the Romish Church everywhere, above all things, they prevail in Italy itself. Such has always been the case. Italy and Rome have always been the scandal of the Roman Catholic Church. Hence, it is impossible not to hail anything which can shake

a system so injurious to the temporal, intellectual, and moral interests of man. No doubt, at the present time, there is much to favour such a movement. There is the political feeling, the intense hostility to the Pope of Rome as the prince whose authority has always interfered with the political aspirations of the country; there is also intense animosity against the clergy who have so largely had a share in the education of the children, whose education, in consequence, has been neglected or corrupted. At the same time, the question is, What is to be substituted in its place? I cannot but, on the whole, sympathize with the principles upon this subject which have guided and marked the recommendation and spirit of Mr. Meyrick. I cannot condemn the action of those who, under any circumstances, will substitute truth for such a power and domination as that which any man who has seen Italy knows exists there. I have had the opportunity of visiting the valleys of the Vaudois, and found there excellent and pure-minded men; but their system seems peculiarly ill-adapted to the Italian mind, and in every way I think it is impossible to expect that the Vaudois system can supersede that of the Roman Church. But when I see the purity of their lives and doctrine, and the way in which their teaching falls in with that spirit now prevailing in the Italian mind, namely, intense resistance to priestly domination of any kind, I cannot but feel they have their part to play in the ultimate result. There is a stirring, no doubt, as Mr. Meyrick has described, among a good number, even of the priests themselves, especially in the North of Italy. There, something of a feeling of independence of Rome has, I believe, always prevailed, and a jealousy of the influence of the Court of Rome. There have been some distinctions of rite, and they cannot entirely forget that their great archbishop, of whom they are so proud (St. Ambrose), received no authority from the Pope of Rome. These things have combined with a better government; for no doubt, under the Austrian rule, in spite of its uncongeniality with the feelings of Italy, a better government and the greater wealth of the country have contributed to raise among the priests of Lombardy a higher tone of feeling than exists in those parts of Italy under the direct influence of Rome. There it is we have found some most eminent writers. We have found Tiboni, whose work upon the Bible is one of the most able and learned that has ever been written. He has shown that at all times when it was intended to propagate the Gospel in a new country the translation of the Scripture had been the first step, and he urges that the Bible should be made known to the whole population. In the same district you have found the Abbe Perfetti, whose works show the purest spirit. When you have a man telling you, "I have met pious souls who look only to Christ, true saints on earth, but I never found one who has come to that state under priestly influence—no, not one." When this can be said by such a man, what an evidence there is of the necessity of some great reform! What are we to do to help them? I cannot think it is our business to utter a word of dictation. It is not our business to say "do this," or "do that." I cannot see what the result of this awful movement is to be. At any moment there might come a change over the spirit of the Court of Rome, and they may say, "Rather than lose our hold over Italy altogether we will make some compromise with the government;" and I am not quite sure that, looking to men of the government, except that enlightened man whose name has been mentioned, any sacrifice would not be made to secure the support of the Court of Rome within the United Kingdom of Italy. Therefore, I cannot see, with any confidence, what the future may be. But there is one point which is clear. We cannot be far wrong in giving them the advantage of that Bible which we have had amongst ourselves so long; we cannot do wrong in giving them the advantage of that Liturgy which has been the result of the study of antiquity, and the Scriptures that prevailed at the time of our Reformation. It seems to me that the duty of England is therefore confined to giving them the Scriptures and access to our own Liturgy—not to dictate to them the reforms they should make, but to put within their hands the sources of all knowledge, and the result of our own experience. May I just for one moment read you a passage from a letter I have received this morning from a gentleman who has been living five or six years in Italy quietly watching the progress of events? He says, "Meanwhile, the people are awakening. The Scriptures are penetrating the whole length and breadth of Italy. Thousands read them, and see that there is no truth in those claims which the priesthood of Rome so arrogantly assert. While the priests feel the thrall the laity also feel it. The priests feel the bondage in which they are kept by their superiors, so that it is impossible to be a patriot and priest of Rome at once. The two characters are not compatible. Still, I cannot discover any boldness for the truth of doctrine. All are discontented—slumbering. None come out as men. The laity would back any honest attempts at reform in the matter of auricular compulsory

confession : there are many priests who would do away with celibacy, and the laity would wish this scandal removed from among them. The whole system of buying and selling ordinances of religion must be reformed. So far, all is ready for reform." This is a fair statement of the present condition of things in Italy. I recollect meeting in Naples the editor of a publication called *The Pillar of Fire*, which went on for some time with much spirit; first, merely against the temporal power of the Pope; then, to advocate the teaching of the Bible. I met the editor afterwards—he was a little fiery Calabrese priest—and he said, "The more we discuss these things the further we are inclined to go, for we find there is no point of standing where we are." That paper was protected for a while by the peculiar authority of the King of Naples, but it ultimately came to an end. At the same moment there were sermons going on, under the sanction of the Pope, in the leading Church of Naples, which were assertions of as pure doctrine as can be got in any of our own churches. All these and many other similar things are going on all over Italy, and whether they will end in pure negation, or be repressed by the hand of priestly and secular power together, we know not. All we can say is that we bid them God speed, and all we can do for them is to assist them in the circulation of the Scriptures, and give them the advantage and use of our own Liturgy.

The Rev. F. G. LEE : I thank you for the hearty cheer with which you have received me. It is because you believe the association of which I am the secretary (the Association for Promoting the Unity of Christendom), though a very humble movement, is nevertheless a power and an influence. It has this influence, that it is——

The PRESIDENT : This, I think, is hardly to the point.

Mr. LEE : I will show you in what way.

The PRESIDENT : The development of your views about the society is quite another thing from thanking the company for the cheer with which they welcomed you.

Mr. LEE : The meeting is to consider the state and prospects of the Churches of Western Europe. Surely, then, to put the matter in another form, we can hardly fail to remember that since the last Congress a book has been published of the greatest possible importance with regard to our relations with the rest of Western Christendom, and it would be a shame if this Congress passed over without signifying its admiration both of the writer and the book. The association of which I am the secretary simply embodies the principle of that book, and that book, I say, has a most intimate connection with the subject, with all deference to your lordship, before the Congress this afternoon. I am quite sure I shall be allowed, with all respect to the chair and those who differ from me, to set forth in a few words some principles which should guide the Church of England in her relations with foreign Churches and Churchmen.

The PRESIDENT : I really do not wish to interrupt any speaker, but the committee advisedly omitted the word "relations" with foreign Churches from the programme. The subject is "The State and Prospects of the Churches of Western Europe."

Mr. LEE : Then, if I may be allowed, for the third time I'll slightly shift my ground. I say for the third time that I will consider the state and prospects of the Churches of Western Europe. At all events, then, we may consider the state of our own Church and its connection with the rest of Christendom. I do think it extremely hard that——(interruption.) Will you give me the opportunity——. I speak under——(interruption.) Yes, but I am speaking as to the state and prospects of the Churches of Western Europe, and I am saying that the publication of the great *Eirenicon* of Dr. Pusey is of great relation to them. Allow me to ask the meeting what we have heard from the last few speakers? One of them has rejoiced that a certain number of priests who are interdicted exist in Paris. Is that a matter of rejoicing for any member of the Church of England if he is fair and honest? Then again we have heard it as a matter of rejoicing——. We have heard it as a matter of rejoicing——. We have heard it as a matter of rejoicing——.

The PRESIDENT : I do not think it is within the limits of order to question the fairness and honesty of previous speakers.

Mr. LEE : We have heard speakers say what I have already indicated, and we have likewise heard one say that Cardinal D'Andrea does not give obedience to an individual to whom he has sworn to do so. Is that a thing to applaud in a Christian Congress? Supposing I had appealed from the Archbishop in the chair, to the Archbishop better informed, as did Cardinal D'Andrea in the case of the Pope, I should have been carrying out precisely the same principle. I think you treat me very unfairly; possibly you are afraid of my arguments. The real mode of considering the state and prospects of the Churches of Western Christendom is to continue the work commenced thirty years ago, and which is being continued in such an efficient way in all parts of the

two great provinces in this country. That is the way in which we can show Western Christendom what we are, what we claim, what we hope to become. Than we shall be able to promote the still greater work which I must not mention, but of which you perfectly know to what I refer. Until we have obtained that, many of our home and missionary efforts will be poor and impotent. If those who set forth that which we have to consider with regard to our missionary works at home and abroad were always and at all times fair, I fear failure would have to be written upon their results, whereas if the general body of the Churches of Christendom could act together and not independently, then, indeed, we might find their state very much higher than at the present time. Moreover, I think in our consideration of their prospects and our own the best thing to do is first to mend our own windows and then ask other persons to mend theirs. Let us cast the mote out of our own eye before we attempt to touch the beam in our brother's. It is a matter of notoriety that until members of the great Christian family are one, the state and prospects of every national Church, and the whole Church collectively, will be weak and impotent in comparison with the early days of the Church. The good work, however, is commenced, and will be carried on not merely in this but in other countries, until the brook that has already become a river will swell into a sea. Let us join in promoting this work, in the way I have rather hinted at than stated.

ARCHDEACON DENISON : We have got a little disturbed I think. I should like, after my manner, to throw a little oil upon the troubled waters. Let me just, if I may be allowed for a moment or two, say a word upon a matter personal to myself. I would, if I could, leave York without leaving a trace of painful feeling on any man's mind for anything I have said. One word upon that little cricket matter.

THE PRESIDENT : I think it is certainly not in order with regard to this question, but a personal explanation is in almost every deliberative assembly allowed.

ARCHDEACON DENISON : All I meant to say was that I beg to apologise to the meeting for having used words, in the haste of speaking, which did not exactly convey what I meant. I did not mean to say I should have gone to play at cricket. I never did play. I was always bowled out directly, and that is the reason why everybody has always been trying to bowl me down all my life. But my wickets are not down yet. However, what I meant was, if I had been a parishioner of Hursley I should not have stopped to hear the young gentlemen, I should have gone to the cricket field and played if I could. And if I had been Minister of Hursley, I should have gone to look on. With regard to this other matter I confess I do not quite agree; I am unable to agree with what I have heard to-day in this room with that heartiness I could have wished. There are many things in which I could not agree with my friend who spoke last; but there was one thing I did agree with, and that is that we had better mend our own windows. When you come to remember what an anomalous state we are in in this country, what can you say? Why, the very existence of this Congress is a proof of what I say. What can be more anomalous than a Church Congress in a Church Catholic? It is one of those attempts to struggle out of one of those states of existence in which we have somehow got, and is improper and anomalous. As to the Œcumenical Council, before that time comes to pass, we must have a council of the whole Anglican communion. When we have done that—the whole Anglican communion—the mother Church of England and all those other churches which have sprung from her,—have come to that hearty and cordial agreement upon all their principles, and are able to present in the face of all the churches of Western Europe the whole principles of the Anglican communion for the first time in its corporate condition, we shall be in a better position to go forward. I do not want to see England turned into a spiritual propaganda. As for political propagandism, this is not the place to speak of it; but I may just say we have come to that state of mind now when we do not want to go on bullying little people and trucking to great people; and it is not the business of England, in her anxious and critical religious state, to turn herself into a spiritual propagandist. Here is a large party of people in this country, laymen and clergymen, who want to get rid of the actual state of things. They want not a Catholic and Apostolic Church any more, but what they call the Broad Church, a comprehensive thing that will include all sects and denominations. What is the result? You will get rid first of your Prayer Book; secondly, of your Articles. (No, no.) I say "yes." It is impossible to have a Broad Church with our Prayer Book and Articles; it is out of the question. If you are going to wipe away dogma from the face of Christianity you may have a Broad Church, but you cannot do it without. Here is a proposition to sweep away the Catholic and apostolic character of the Church of England, and to

retain its national character. I was travelling the other day with a dear friend of mine, who has entirely changed his politics. What did he say? He said, "Mind, I once agreed with you." And I said, "Yes, I know." He said, "Mind, it is not a question whether it shall be an establishment in England or not, but whether the establishment shall be a dogmatic establishment or not." I said, "I know that; that is the question." I say this is what is in thousands of men's minds; they want to keep the national establishment, but to get rid of its dogmatic character. It is out of such things as this that comes the Conscience clause.

ARCHDEACON CHURTON: I wish only to remark that the observations of the last two speakers seem to imply that I had proposed we should take an active interference in the affairs of foreign churches. Not one syllable of that kind could be gathered from my paper. My opinion is, and always has been, that we may wish them to mend their windows, and wish them well if they do so, but that they must do it at their own cost and in their own way. I stand for National Churches because I believe Nationalism is used by certain parties now as nothing but a nickname, by which we are to get rid of patriotism.

His Grace the President pronounced the Benediction.

THE CONCLUDING MEETING.

CONGRESS HALL. THURSDAY EVENING.

The Right Hon. the LORD MAYOR in the Chair.

The REV. CANON TREVOR, Secretary, read the following Minutes:—

At the Executive Committee of the York Church Congress, September 18th, 1866, His Grace the President, in the Chair:—Read the following resolution of the Manchester Congress, passed on the 15th October, 1863, on the motion of Mr. Henry Hoare, seconded by Mr. A. J. B. Beresford Hope:—

"That it is desirable to form a Central Committee of the Church Congress, and that the question of the best constitution and rules of such Central Committee be referred to the Secretaries of the present Congress, with instructions to communicate with the Secretaries of Congress at Oxford and Cambridge, as also with those who will act at Bristol, and with the request that they will prepare a Scheme to be laid before the Congress when it meets at Bristol."

The Executive Committee being informed that this resolution was referred from the Bristol Congress to that of Norwich, and by the latter to the meeting at York, where it may be expected that some definite scheme will be submitted, agreed to the following draft of regulations.

1. That the Central Committee shall consist of such Presidents and Secretaries of the existing and former Congresses, as may be able to meet at the Congress town on the day before the opening of the Congress, to consider of the most eligible place for the next year's assembly.
2. That the Invitations for this purpose be addressed to the Secretaries of the then approaching Congress, and shall express the consent of the Bishop to the Congress being held in his Diocese.
3. That the President of the existing Congress be requested to notify the place selected by the Central Committee in his opening address, and to fix a time for the reception of the Committee's report.
4. That the formation of an Executive Committee at the place selected by the existing Congress being notified to the Central Committee, they shall transmit such papers and suggestions as they may deem advisable, and so terminate their functions.

RESOLVED—

1. That this draft be communicated to the Presidents and Secretaries of the Bristol and Norwich Congresses, and that they be invited to meet the President and Secretaries of this Congress at York, on Monday, the 8th October, to consider and report

the same with such amendments as they may think fit for the decision of the Congress.

2. That such meeting of Presidents and Secretaries be requested to act as the Central Committee *pro hac vice*.

The President and Secretaries assembled at the Congress having considered the foregoing draft, agreed to report the same as amended for the approval of Congress.

Having further considered the invitation of the Mayor of Wolverhampton, sanctioned by the Lord Bishop of the Diocese, and supported by the Rural Deans and the local Clergy, the President and Secretaries recommend that the same be accepted, and that Wolverhampton be the place of meeting next year.—W. EBOR.

ARCHDEACON DENISON, in moving the adoption of the Report: I cannot take part in bringing our proceedings to a close without expressing my very great satisfaction at all that has taken place. If we have had any little differences, they have been as nothing. I do not believe that any great gathering of this kind would be worth much unless there was something of that sort; because if there was not, people would not believe that there was any heart about it. Therefore I do not make any exception in expressing in my own name—and I think I may without presumption also say that I am speaking the sense of my brethren of the clergy and the laity present—I do not make any exception to the great satisfaction which I feel in being called upon to take part in these proceedings. It is no part of my business to say anything about the report—that I leave in better hands—all I have to do is to ask you to accept what has been placed before you, and to accept it with grateful feelings for all that has been done at this Congress to set forth the Church of England in this ancient city. I look forward with great hope to the good that will be done, with God's blessing, by holding our meetings in the thriving centres of the great manufacturing interests of this great country. To get into the great centres of the English population—this is a great thing for the Church of England to do, and I cannot but think that there is nothing more gratifying than to see the manner in which the Church is making her way into the very heart of the manufacturing districts. It will be but just that we should express our thankfulness to those who have so ably conducted the present Congress; and I feel quite sure that every one present will gladly do so. Now I should like everybody to go away from this meeting with nothing but pleasant recollections, and if I have said or done anything that has given any one the smallest offence, I hope it will be forgotten. Life is not long enough for a good many things, and there is one for which it is certainly not long enough, and that is quarrelling or perpetuating any strife that may have arisen in the heat of controversy or the excitement of the moment.

MR. BERESFORD HOPE, M.P.: It is with peculiar satisfaction that I rise to second this resolution which has been proposed by my venerable friend, and which reminds me of another resolution which I had the honour three years ago to second at Manchester. That motion has been incubated for these three years, and it therefore now comes forward, I may say, timely and maturely hatched. There is a melancholy feeling connected with that resolution; for I was the seconder of a dear and honoured friend of my own—one to whom more than to any other is owing that great spirit of association amongst clergymen and laymen which has flashed like the electric current through the length and breadth of the land—I mean the noble hearted, devoted, chivalrous Henry Hoare. That resolution was proposed in a committee room at the Manchester Congress, in 1863, by Henry Hoare; and though Henry Hoare was not the immediate father of these Congresses, he was their grandfather. I would rather not raise a laugh in connection with his name, but what I have stated is the simple truth. It was he who suggested the meeting of lay consultees, which led to the Church Defence Association at Cambridge—the University to which he and I had both the happiness, the privilege, and the honour to belong. Our Cambridge Defence Association led two active men whom I am glad to see present—Archdeacon Emery and Mr. Beamont—let honour be given to whom honour belongs—and these two gentlemen were the actual creators of Church Congresses. I say that our Cambridge Defence Association led Archdeacon Emery, Mr. Beamont, and their colleagues to organise their Congress. The then Bishop of Ely was a very aged and not particularly active, though a very learned, prelate; and the chair was therefore taken in one of the college halls by Archdeacon Francis. We thought our Congress was a very great success, though we only mustered somewhere about 100 or 150 strong. We sat for three days, and we had much the same kind of discussions, papers, and general system, though our numbers were not much larger than those which I see on this platform. Then

came the great gathering at Oxford; and then came a great experiment. So far we had met amongst churches and college chapels; but now, we said, we will go amongst the people of our great manufacturing towns. We therefore had our Manchester Congress. That was a very great success. Then a committee was appointed to consider what should be done to make these gatherings a permanent institution. That committee, looking at the fact that it was a fluctuating committee, felt the absolute and indispensable necessity of establishing the thing on a permanent basis; and so Manchester passed it on to Bristol. Bristol was also a great success, but still the job was not done. Then Norwich took it in hand; and now at York, at this most successful of our meetings, where Antiquity and Novelty have shaken hands under the shade of your majestic cathedral, the time has come when the clergy and laity of England may take up the concern and accept these rules which have been proposed to us by the committee. I am much rejoiced that our next Congress will be held, not among the pleasant cloisters of some grand cathedral, but in the very grimy heart of our grand Black Country—in Wolverhampton itself. I trust as a Churchman, as a squire, as a churchwarden, as a member of Parliament, that you will all come to meet us in Staffordshire. As to Wolverhampton, it has a collegiate church, which for long years mouldered to decay. It had a Dean and Chapter, and it was universally neglected. At last a noble earl, whom I am glad to see here, [Lord Harrowby, an Ecclesiastical Commissioner], laid the hand of the spoiler upon it. He un-Deaned it and un-Chaptered it; but the old church has been restored in the humbler character of a parish church, and if I may believe report (for I have not seen it myself), Wolverhampton now shows forth the beauty of holiness and the fervour of godliness in a manner that offers a bright example to other great towns. "This relates to the next resolution?" Of course it does. But Archdeacon Denison went into it, and I will do the same. You see, ladies and gentlemen, how we are sat upon by those in authority. I have said all I had got to say, and I might have stopped half a minute sooner, but it is necessary to be contumacious. Nevertheless, though I have been contumacious and irregular, and a sort of Cossack, I trust that I have said nothing to provoke opposition to this resolution.

THE LORD MAYOR: I am glad to hear it stated by Mr. Beresford Hope that the present Congress is the most successful that has yet been held. I quite concur with the venerable mover of the resolution in thinking that if we had had no little troubles there might have been a doubt as to the earnestness of the parties, or their honesty. I quite concur with him also that if by any chance a painful feeling should have been created in any breast, it should have been allowed to pass entirely away; and I hope that, grand and successful as this Congress has been, the one to be held at Wolverhampton will exhibit a further advance in influence and usefulness.

The motion was then put and agreed to.

THE DEAN OF YORK: In moving the next resolution, I cannot refrain from congratulating, in the first instance, this meeting and the members of this Church Congress on the magnificent assembly which we behold this evening at this our concluding meeting. If this Congress has been—as I am thankful to say it unquestionably has—a most indubitable success, I believe that a large portion of that success is owing to the kind co-operation which has been afforded by the municipal authorities, and in no small degree by our most excellent chief magistrate, the present Lord Mayor. The motion which I have the honour to submit for your consideration is, that the invitation of the Mayor of Wolverhampton be accepted, and that the Congress meet in that town next year. In doing so I can only express my confident belief that the Mayor of Wolverhampton will be ready to follow in the steps of your lordship. I happen to know something about the county of Stafford; and I believe that that county will not be behind any in giving a cordial welcome to the Church Congress. I hold in my hand a letter from the Mayor of Wolverhampton expressing an earnest hope that the Church Congress will accept the invitation, adding, what nobody could for a moment doubt, that it has the sanction of the Lord Bishop of the diocese.

THE DEAN OF ELY: I have great pleasure in seconding the resolution which has already been moved by the Very Rev. the Dean of York. I do so with great satisfaction because I am quite sure that the results which have flowed from this and previous Congresses are sufficient to justify the belief that the holding of them in future will be a great blessing to the Church of England. We have now had certainly one of the most—perhaps I may say, the most—successful Congresses ever held, and therefore these gatherings may be said to have the sanction and authority of the warm-hearted, high-spirited, sensible, hard-headed people of Yorkshire. Last year at Norwich, when there was an invitation to come here, and it was moved by the Bishop

of Oxford that we should come, the right rev. prelate said that hospitality was, after all, somewhat of a barbarous virtue, which he believed did belong to the county of York. He admitted that the hospitality of my county, Norfolk, was great; but he said, "Only come to York, and then you will find what hospitality really is." Well, comparisons we all know are odious; and therefore I would be the last man to make comparison between the two counties. Let me rather say how thankful I am to the county and city of York for the kind and admirable manner in which they have received the Congress. I feel under a considerable difficulty in seconding this resolution. My difficulty arises partly from the fact that the Lord Archbishop gave positive notice that Sir Roundell Palmer's lecture would begin precisely at half-past seven, whereas it is now about eleven minutes and a half beyond the half-hour; and as a Cambridge man, therefore, I have exactly—11½ min. in which to make my speech. Then I have another difficulty. Mr. Beresford-Hope has been guilty of a crime which I know that as J.P. he would visit with the greatest severity. I understood him to recommend himself to you under a variety of characters. He told you he was a member of Parliament, that he was a churchwarden, but that, above all, he was a country squire. Now, what crime is there that to a country squire is worse than any other? Why, it is poaching. And what crime has Mr. Beresford-Hope been guilty of, if not of poaching upon my manor? And therefore, my Lord Archbishop—the clergy and the laity are here so happily blended that the mistake is pardonable—I was going, my Lord Mayor, to appeal to your kindness, as Mr. Beresford-Hope has taken from me what I ought to say, not to call me to order for saying anything that I ought not to say. As regards Wolverhampton, I shall be very glad to go there because I know very little about it. I once travelled through Wolverhampton, but my notions of it are confined to two or three strong whistles and the ringing of a bell. I shall therefore be glad to make a Christian and Churchman-like acquaintance with it. I have, however, the honour of knowing the Bishop, and without making odious comparisons, I may say there is no wiser prelate amongst us. I do not say this as at all wishing to compliment him—for that is quite unnecessary—but because it is a very considerable seal put to our Congresses, that the Lord Bishop of Lichfield should be willing to preside at one. I would venture, in conclusion, to say, do not let this grand Congress separate without doing something. Let us make up our minds before we meet again that in some way or other—it is not for me to dictate how—these Congresses shall not end in talk but shall end in action. And, now ladies and gentlemen, and my Lord Mayor—I have committed the worst sin a clergyman can be guilty of—I have wandered from my text, and for so doing I throw myself upon your mercy. I do not intend to go back to it, but content myself with seconding the resolution.

THE LORD MAYOR: The two last gentlemen who have spoken remind me of the lines—

"The faults of our neighbours with freedom we blame,
But tax not ourselves for doing the same."

I beg to thank them for the kind mention they have made of the Corporation: and I will take this opportunity of stating that I have found amongst my fellow-citizens but one desire, and that is to do their utmost to give a cordial reception to the clergy, not only of England, but of the world. As to the Mayor of Wolverhampton, I hope that before the Congress meets again, he will either be re-elected, or that he will have a worthy successor.

The motion was then put and agreed to.

HIS GRACE THE PRESIDENT THEN TOOK THE CHAIR.

ENGLISH CHURCH HYMNODY,

Illustrated by a Choir under the direction of E. G. Monk, Esq., Mus. Doc.

THE CHAIRMAN: I now call upon Sir Roundell Palmer to give you the lecture which he has so kindly promised. I ought to say that our meeting this evening is not for discussion, and no one therefore need spend his time in needless preparation. We have come here to listen to Sir Roundell Palmer, and we have the pleasing privilege of being silent ourselves.

SIR ROUNDELL PALMER READ THE FOLLOWING PAPER:—

1. THE term "Hymnology" may have seemed to promise more than I mean upon this occasion to attempt. I do not pretend to deal with the musical part of the subject, nor to enter upon so wide a field as the history or criticism of the hymns of all nations and languages. I shall confine myself to English hymnody, with reference chiefly to its use in the public worship of the Church of England.

2. I begin with assuming (what might easily be proved) that the use of hymns or anthems, not set forth by authority, is allowable in our public worship, whenever it does not interrupt the continuity of any prescribed order of the Church.

3. The object of hymnody, although its use is variable and discretionary, is, of course, not merely to afford relief during the pauses of a more serious duty: it is in itself, when rightly understood and applied, an act of worship of the highest, heartiest, and most intelligent kind. "I confess," said Richard Baxter, "that harmony and melody are the pleasure and elevation of my soul, and have made a psalm of praise in the holy assembly the chief delightful exercise of my religion and my life, and hath helped to bear down all the objections which I have heard against Church music." To give it this character, the choice of hymns ought to be made upon the principle that their matter and words are of cardinal importance; the music being accessory to the sense, and chosen with a view to give it lively and harmonious expression. When "praises" are "sung with understanding," it is not only a fit utterance of the higher spiritual emotions, to "a mind in tune," with the "powers in vigorous exercise," the "thoughts bright and intense," and "the whole soul awake" (words which I have adopted from Simon Browne);—it is not only a powerful instrument for the education, direction, and development of those emotions, in a mind less active and mature; but it is very often a key by which the inner meaning and spiritual application of Scripture and of its language and imagery is opened and made practical to simple people, far better than by expositions or commentaries. The opinion, which once prevailed, that nothing but psalms taken directly from Scripture ought to be sung in the congregation, was narrow and groundless: but the substance of Scripture, assimilated and made part of the spiritual life, has always supplied the principal matter for the best hymns; and this may explain why excellent hymns have been written by persons who have given no proofs of skill in any other kind of poetry. Religious enthusiasm, fed by the poetry of inspiration, grows like that which it lives upon, and reflects the warmth and light which it could not have originated.

4. If a hymn ought to be the expression of lively apprehensions of spiritual things, and of genuine religious emotions and aspirations, in the mouth of the worshipper, it is evident that it must have come, with these characters, fresh from the heart and mind of the person who wrote it. To be "recited with rapture" (I again use the words of Simon Browne), ought it to be "written under a kind of inspiration." Whatever detracts from this, mars its effect. And, for this reason, it ought not to be vulgar, prosaic, or didactic; it

should be high in tone, simple and pure in taste and feeling, and not without some touch of the fire and energy of poetry.

5. From these premises I draw certain conclusions, which I will proceed to state and enforce as far as I am able: and, if I occupy a little time in doing so, my excuse must be that I do not find them so generally accepted by others as (with the belief I have of their justice and importance) I could wish them to be.

6. My first conclusion is that a healthy natural taste is more to be trusted in the composition and selection of hymns than technical rules, supposed to be derived from antiquity, or from the criticism of the works of other ages. The ancient hymn-writers did not, in fact, work by such rules: their manner was natural, and suitable to their time; but it does not follow that it should be a law to ours. A passage is sometimes quoted from St. Augustine, in which he speaks of a hymn as a "song of praise to God:" and this definition has been offered as one of the tests by which all hymns ought to be approved or rejected. But what can be the value of a definition which would exclude every hymn of which the spirit is supplication rather than praise? I know not whether this rule is supposed to require that a hymn should assume the form of a direct invocation or address to God: yet I am at a loss to understand on what other ground Addison's hymn, "*The spacious firmament on high,*" can have been thought to offend against it, by a learned writer in the *Quarterly Review* of January, 1862; who adds, "if it is poetry, it is certainly not song; yet has been brought, by old associations, into many hymn-books." For my own part I fervently hope that it may always remain there. Praise to God, as glorified in His works, is the substance and essence of every part of that hymn, as it is of the beautiful verses of the 19th Psalm on which it is founded. If it be not poetry, I do not know what is; and to prove that it is song (and soul-stirring song too) it is only necessary to hear it (as I often have) heartily sung to an appropriate tune.

7. Another arbitrary rule (also advocated by considerable authority) condemns the use, in hymns, of the singular pronouns "*I*" and "*my*," instead of the plural "*we*" and "*our*," as "inconsistent with the united song of a congregation looking God-ward," and opposed to the spirit of the early Church. Such a point ought surely to be determined by reason, not authority: and I cannot find for it any good reason. Private meditations, which express the circumstances, experiences, or emotions of particular persons, in a way distinctively applicable to those individuals, are (of course) not appropriate for public use. But, if an act of praise or worship, suitable for the participation of Christians in general, takes form naturally as the song of an individual soul "looking God-ward," its simultaneous adoption and application to himself by every member of a congregation makes it as much "the united song of the congregation" as if it were conceived in the plural. A congregation is the aggregate of a number of individuals: it cannot "look God-ward," except through those individuals. The essence of public Christian worship consists in the combination of the separate devotion of each particular person present, with the sense of Christian brotherhood, binding them all together. The *Quarterly Reviewer*, for reasons not satisfactory to my

mind, thinks the incorporation of the Psalms of David, and other Scripture-songs, (which generally run in the first person singular), into both Jewish and Christian worship, irrelevant to this question. But the first person singular is also used in the Apostolic and Nicene Creeds; which, in the public services of the Church, are hymns of the most solemn kind, and embody the common profession of faith of the whole congregation: and the *Te Deum*, although expressed (down to the last verse) in the plural, ends with a petition in the singular number. This rule (like the former) tends to proscribe most supplicatory hymns. Such hymns as "*Rock of Ages, cleft for me*;" "*When I survey the wonderous Cross*;" "*Jesus, Lover of my soul*;" "*My God, my Father, while I stray*;" "*Nearer, my God, to Thee*;" "*Abide with me, fast falls the eventide*;" Ken's Morning and Evening Hymns; and Keble's "*Sun of my soul, Thou Saviour dear*," are proved, by the common assent of most of our Churches, to be fit for united song by the congregation: yet the singular form is as proper and necessary in them as the plural can possibly be in others. Even with respect to antiquity, a canon which would condemn the "*Dies Iræ*" does not seem to me to be entitled to very profound veneration.

8. My next conclusion is, that good native English hymns are, generally speaking, to be preferred to translations properly so called. It is the peculiar defect of metrical translation that it cannot give the natural manner, or the real mind, either of the author or of the translator. It is a curious exercise of art, not a spontaneous production. It moves in fetters: it is compelled to find substitutes (for want of precise equivalents in different languages) for the finer touches, which give colour and character to the original. Under the exigencies of verse and rhyme, it is alternately diluted with expletives, and starved by arbitrary compression. It aims at being a copy, under conditions which make complete success impossible.

9. These observations apply, with especial force, to metrical versions of the Psalms; which are, perhaps, of all compositions, the most unfit for such treatment. No one can read the prose translations of the Psalms in our Bibles and Prayer-books, without feeling their extreme power and beauty: no one can pass from them to the "Old" or "New" Version, or to any other of the numerous similar attempts, without perceiving that (with very rare exceptions) the power and beauty are gone; that the water-springs have dried up, and the fruitful land has become barren. Not only the authors of the "Old" and "New" and Scotch Versions, but Sir Philip Sidney and his sister the Countess of Pembroke, Milton in his boyhood, Wither, Sandys, Sir John Denham, John Keble, and many more, have tried what could be done, upon the principle of a strict and full adherence to the Hebrew sense. It is not too much to say, that all of them have failed. From the collective results of their labours it would be difficult to extract more than about fifteen or twenty Psalms, or portions of Psalms, really good and suitable for singing in our public services: and few of these are of any high order of merit. On the other hand, those writers who, without professing to translate, founded hymns of their own upon passages or thoughts which they felt to be suitable for the purpose, either in the Psalms or in other parts of Scripture, (as Addison, Watts, Doddridge, Lyte, and James Montgomery), have contributed to English hymnody

many of its richest treasures. To reckon works of this class among "psalms," as distinguished from "hymns," (as has been done in many books), is a manifest error: but, when they are subtracted, little remains for the sake of which it can be worth while to continue that distinction.

10. The same observations hold true, though in a less degree, with respect to translations from the primitive Church, and from the German. Generally, such translations are neither ancient nor modern, neither foreign nor English. Those from the Greek and Latin are apt to be stiff and mannered, without the easy flow and vigorous simplicity of the originals. Those which avoid these faults have not always the character of popular hymns; and this is especially the case with translations from the German, in which language the originals (perhaps from some peculiarity in the genius of that nation) are usually odes or elegiac poems, rather than hymns proper for use in our services.

11. If I might suggest a practical criterion of the value of translated hymns, it would be this. They should be judged as if they were English compositions, in every sense original, without any bias from reverence for antiquity, or ecclesiastical associations. The mind should be on its guard against the influence of beauties, known and admired in the foreign originals, but which are difficult to be preserved in translation. If, tried by this test, they are found to be good and thoroughly vernacular English hymns, such as, coming from any quarter, we should have been glad to accept, they will undoubtedly be entitled to a place in our hymnals; but, otherwise, they ought to be excluded. Out of the many interesting translations which we possess from ancient hymns (chiefly by Mant, Isaac Williams, Chandler, Neale, Caswall, and Chambers), and from the German (by Jacobi, the Wesleys, Mr. Massie, Mr. Russell, Miss Winkworth, Miss Cox, and others), a small number may probably be collected, which will stand this test. The shorter translation from the "*Veni Creator*," in the Ordination Service; Isaac Williams's "*Our praise Thou need'st not, but Thy love*;" Ray Palmer's "*Jesus, Thou Joy of loving hearts*;" and Neale's Alleluiaic Sequence, "*The strain upraise of joy and praise*," are good examples.

12. My third deduction from the same principles is, that hymns (or those parts of them which are adopted into our Hymnals) ought to be taken as they are written, with the strictest possible adherence to the words of their authors. It signifies little if we meet, here and there, with a defective rhyme, or a phrase open to criticism: but it is vitally important that there should be no interference with the life, consistency, and reality of the composition, as the true expression of what the writer actually felt when "the fire" was "kindled" within him. It is not the injustice done to the writer upon which I would mainly dwell; although, on that point, the complaint of James Montgomery ought to be heard. "If good people," he says, "cannot conscientiously adopt the writer's diction and doctrine, it is a little questionable in them to impose upon him theirs, which he may as honestly hesitate to receive. Yet this is the cross by which every author of a hymn, who hopes to be useful to his generation, may expect to be tested, at the pleasure of any Christian brother, however

incompetent or little qualified to amend what he may deem amiss, in one of the most delicate and difficult exercises of a tender heart and an enlightened understanding." My complaint, in the general interest of British hymnody, is, that the tendency, and the practical effect, of this system of tampering with the text, is not really to amend, but is to patch, disfigure, spoil, and emasculate; and, even when nothing worse is done, to substitute neutral tints for natural colouring, and a dead for a living sense. A real poet, if he were to suffer himself to change a word or a line in the works of other men whenever he thought they were capable of improvement, would be much more likely to deface what he meddled with, than to produce anything worthy of himself. Much more those who have not the gift of poetry. The old story of the painter who, believing his work to be perfect, invited every bystander to paint over what he did not like, is realised in these cases; there is no part of the composition which one man or another does not find fault with and change; the only difference is, that it is done without invitation. There are hardly any conditions of mind more opposed to each other, than the spirit of minute criticism and that of poetical enthusiasm; and when a work, composed under the poetical impulse, is altered by a stranger in the critical mood, it cannot be wondered at if the result described by Ovid follows:—

" *Frigida pugnabant calidis, humentia siccis,
Mollia cum duris, sine pondere habentia pondus.*"

There is a medley of hot and cold, moist and dry, soft and hard, weighty matter and matter without weight.

13. What has been said of alteration leads naturally to abbreviation; which, indeed, is in many cases advantageous, and in not a few unavoidable. But, if it is worth while to sing hymns at all, it is worth while to allow as much time for singing as will make it complete, hearty, and intelligent; and an abridgment or selection of parts, when proper, ought to be so made as to omit nothing which is requisite to unity, symmetry, and completeness, both of structure and of sense. The part taken should be a perfect hymn in itself; the parts omitted ought to be separable, so as to leave behind, when they are removed, no chasm, no sign of mutilation, no abrupt unsatisfactory end. Yet there are some hymn-books in which these principles are entirely lost sight of: books which seem to have been manufactured with the scissors, without much aid from the mind; as if it were as easy a thing to measure and cut off two or three inches from a hymn as from a yard of calico or broad-cloth. It is surely better to abstain altogether from compositions, which may be thought to exceed the desirable length, than to use them in this way.

14. If doctrinal or theological reasons are pleaded for the system of alteration and curtailment against which I contend, my answer is—By all means let any hymn be rejected which is really open to a well founded doctrinal objection; but do not make a compromise by patching in such cases; do not endeavour to exorcise the heresy by spoiling the hymn; and, in the first instance, do not examine into its orthodoxy in a narrow suspicious temper, so as to conjure up doctrinal errors where there really are none. The office of a hymn is not to teach

controversial theology, but to give the voice of song to practical religion. No doubt, to do this, it must embody sound doctrine; but it ought to do so, not after the manner of the schools, but with the breadth, freedom, and simplicity of the Fountain-head. Whatever does this ought to be frankly and cordially accepted, without regard to any peculiarities of the sect or party to which the author may have belonged. Sound and good words need not be taken in a crooked sense, because the writer may have professed or may have controversially denied this or that dogma. Scripture is large and comprehensive, presenting both the poles and the whole circumference of truth; and it is following in the track of error to see truth on one side only, and to disparage one aspect of it because those who rejoice in that may be insensible to another. Newton said well, in his Preface to the Olney Hymns, "As the workings of the heart of man and of the Spirit of God are, in general, the same in all who are the subjects of grace, I hope most of these hymns, being the fruit and expression of my own experience, will coincide with the views of real Christians of all denominations." When a hymn real in feeling, good in taste, poetical in thought and execution, has this essentially Catholic tone, nothing more is necessary to prove its fitness for the use of good Churchmen; when this tone is wanting, when it diverges from the common central ground to points more disputable, it may, or it may not, be orthodox; but it is seldom, if ever, excellent.

15. If the objection be, not that the theology of a hymn is unsound, but that its tone or language is irreverent or too familiar, I admit this also (supposing the criticism to be well founded, as it sometimes is) to be a good reason, not for the alteration, but for the rejection of the hymn. But here, too, there is great need of sound discrimination. Coldness is not reverence; nor is all warmth of expression undue familiarity. If that love which is the highest attainment, towards which the mind of every Christian ought to be directed, is a real lively affection of the heart, and not an abstract principle, then the emotions and the language proper to that affection cannot be banished from our hymns, merely because the English tongue uses one term to express the two ideas, which the Greeks distinguished by their words "*ἀγάπη*" and "*ἔρως*," or because other words may have a similar double use. Men certainly not irreverent, (as George Herbert and Bishop Ken,) habitually used such language, with a warmth and freedom far exceeding what would be suitable for general adoption; and I remember a criticism even of the *Christian Year*, in which exception was taken, on this ground, to some passages in that work of one of the most reverent among men. Charles Wesley's hymn, "*Jesus, Lover of my soul*," has been blamed on this account: if justly, I do not see why like blame should not attach to the Latin hymn, "*Jesu dulcedo cordium*," and to several others. Of which I would say, that, where (as in these cases) the ideas and imagery are all suggested by those Scriptures which are continually read in our churches, while the context, and the whole tone and spirit of the composition, utterly repel every low and irreverent thought, it does seem to me to be a very unhealthy criticism, which would call up earthly associations, in order to found upon them censure, not otherwise deserved.

16. Argument is best enforced by example: and examples of

vicious alteration abound in almost every hymn-book. Some of the strongest (though not stronger than may be found elsewhere) occur in *Hymns for the Church of England*—a book upon which much care has evidently been bestowed. The Editor, in the Preface to a recent Edition, (in which he has often partially restored the original text of hymns which he had altered more extensively in one or more former editions), explains his object to have been to make the hymns “agree with the reverent and grave tone of Holy Scripture and the Book of Common Prayer.” The following instances will show the treatment, even in this amended edition, of some of the finest, most spirited, and most popular hymns in the English language; hymns (I venture to say) absolutely unexceptionable in point of doctrine and taste, and which have no more important technical defects than here and there a faulty rhyme, or an over-forcible expression.

(1.) I shall first read the “*Rock of Ages*” as Toplady wrote it.

Rock of Ages, cleft for me,
Let me hide myself in Thee !
Let the water and the Blood,
From Thy riven side which flow'd,
Be of sin the double cure,
Cleanse me from its guilt and power.

Not the labours of my hands
Can fulfil Thy law's demands ;
Could my zeal no respite know,
Could my tears for ever flow,
All for sin could not atone ;
Thou must save, and Thou alone.

Nothing in my hand I bring ;
Simply to Thy Cross I cling ;
Naked, come to Thee for dress ;
Helpless, look to Thee for grace ;
Foul, I to the Fountain fly ;
Wash me, Saviour, or I die !

While I draw this fleeting breath ;
When my eyestrings break in death ;
When I soar through tracts unknown,
See Thee on Thy Judgment-throne ;
Rock of Ages, cleft for me,
Let me hide myself in Thee !

(2.) I now proceed to read it, as it is altered in *Hymns for the Church of England*.

Rock of Ages, cleft for me,
Let me hide myself in Thee !
Let the water and the Blood,
From Thy riven side which flow'd,
Be of sin the double cure,
Save from wrath, and make me pure,

Could my tears for ever flow,
And my zeal no langour know,
All for sin could not atone :
Thou must save, and Thou alone ;
Nothing in my hand I bring,
Simply to Thy Cross I cling.

While I draw this fleeting breath ;
 When mine eyelids close in death ;
 When I hear the midnight cry,
 Telling that the Judge is nigh ;
 Rock of Ages, cleft for me,
 Let me hide myself in Thee !

It will be seen that, in the last line of the first stanza, merely to improve a defective rhyme, the simple force of Toplady's three concentrated ideas, the desire to be made clean, the sense of guilt, and the sense of the power of sin, is lost by the total omission of the latter idea, and by the change of the sense of guilt into the fear of punishment. The two middle stanzas are ungracefully compressed into one, and the word "respite" is, to say the least, unnecessarily altered to "languor:" power being lost, both by the omission of much which contributes to the perfection of Toplady's work, and by the changes in position of the parts retained. In the last stanza, besides "eyelids close" instead of "eyestrings break," (a needless variation which is found in almost every hymn-book,) the fine couplet, "When I soar," &c., is displaced for one entirely new and much less energetic.

Who can say, that there is anything in these variations more agreeable to the tone of Holy Scripture, or of the Book of Common Prayer than in Toplady's work ; or that the entire hymn was so long as to require abridgment ?

My next instance is Doddridge's "*Hark the glad sound!*" than which, I venture to say, a more sweet, vigorous, and perfect composition is not to be found, even in the whole body of ancient hymns :—

(1) This is Doddridge's text.

Hark, the glad sound ! the Saviour comes,
 The Saviour promised long ;
 Let every heart prepare a throne,
 And every voice a song !

He comes, the prisoners to release
 In Satan's bondage held ;
 The gates of brass before Him burst,
 The iron fetters yield,

He comes, from thickest films of vice
 To clear the mental ray,
 And on the eyeballs of the blind
 To pour celestial day.

He comes, the broken heart to bind,
 The bleeding soul to cure,
 And with the treasures of His grace
 To enrich the humble poor.

Our glad Hosannas. Prince of Peace,
 Thy welcome shall proclaim,
 And Heaven's eternal arches ring
 With Thy beloved name.

(2.) It is thus turned in *Hymns for the Church of England* :

Hark, the glad sound ! the Saviour comes,
 The Saviour promised long ;
 Let every heart exult for joy,
 And every voice be song.

He comes, the prisoners to relieve
 In Satan's bondage sealed ;
 The gates of brass before Him burst,
 The iron fetters yield.

He comes, from darkening scales of vice
 To clear the inward sight ;
 And on the eyeballs of the blind
 To pour celestial light.

He comes, the wounded soul to heal,
 The broken heart to bind,
 And with the riches of His grace
 To bless the lowly mind.

Our glad Hosannas, Prince of Peace,
 Thine advent shall proclaim ;
 And Heaven's exalted arches ring
 With Thy most honoured Name.

How inferior the altered work is to the original ! Every single change is gratuitous ; not one for the better ; almost all much for the worse. " Let every heart *prepare a throne*" is turned into " Let every heart *exult for joy*." The prisoners are to be "*relieved*," instead of "*released*." They are "*sealed*," instead of "*held*" in Satan's bondage. The "*thickest films*" are turned into the "*darkening scales*" of vice "*ray*" into "*sight*," and "*day*" into "*light*." And the "*riches*," instead of the "*treasures*," of Christ's grace, are to "*bless*," instead of "*enrich*," "*the lowly mind*," instead of "*the humble poor*." The arches of heaven are "*exalted*," instead of "*eternal*," ; and the Saviour's name is "*most honoured*," instead of "*beloved*."

A third hymn, of like excellence, (with the exception of one stanza, the omission of which the author himself suggested, by enclosing it within brackets, at the time of its first publication,) is Dr. Watt's "*When I survey the wondrous Cross*." His text (omitting the bracketed stanza) is this :—

(1.) When I survey the wondrous Cross
 On which the Prince of glory died,
 My richest gain I count but loss,
 And pour contempt on all my pride.

Forbid it, Lord, that I should boast,
 Save in the death of Christ, my God ;
 All the vain things that charm me most,
 I sacrifice them to His blood.

See from His head, His hands, His feet,
 Sorrow and love flow mingled down !
 Did e'er such love and sorrow meet,
 Or thorns compose so rich a crown ?

Were the whole realm of nature mine,
 That were a present far too small ;
 Love, so amazing, so divine,
 Demands my soul, my life, my all.

In *Hymns for the Church of England*, these four stanzas are transformed as follows :—

(2.) When I survey the wondrous Cross
On which the King of glory died,
My richest gain I count but loss,
And pour contempt on all my pride.

O may I know no other boast
Than Christ, and His atoning blood ;
All the vain things that charm me most,
I plunge beneath that saving flood.

Behold his head, His hands, His feet ;
See love and sorrow flowing down :
Did e'er such love and sorrow meet,
Or thorns compose so rich a crown ?

Blest Lord, by whom alone I live,
Who hast my life redeemed, may I
To Thee both soul and body give,
And sinful passions crucify.

There is just enough of Watts left here to remind one of Horace's saying, that you may know the remains of a poet, even when he is torn to pieces : but how is it possible that any man, knowing the original, can prefer the substitute ?

17. What has been said requires two, and (so far as I am aware) only two qualifications. First, there may be cases in which part of a composition, well suited for use as a hymn, requires some change in the commencement, or in words of connection or reference, to sever it from its context ; or in which some antiquated form of expression, or some word, no longer popularly understood in the sense intended by the author, might (if allowed to remain) have a disturbing effect, or might suggest incongruous associations. I do not say that alteration in such cases may not be justified : but, if so, it should be limited by the necessity which justifies it, and should be tolerated only, as the less of two evils ; like the restoration of a broken statue, or a damaged picture. Madan was not blameable for altering the word "welkin" in the first line of Charles Wesley's Christmas Hymn—

Hark ! how all the welkin rings,
Glory to the King of Kings !

But he went beyond the necessity of the case, in the well-known couplet which he substituted—

Hark ! the herald angels sing,
Glory to the new-born King !

And, in so doing, he departed from the substance of the angelic song, to which Wesley had adhered. Still less was he warranted in proceeding to change the fine lines at the end of the stanza—

Universal Nature say,
Christ the Lord is born to-day !

into the very inferior couplet—

With th' angelic host proclaim,
Christ is born in Bethlehem!

18. Secondly, there is a difference between patchwork alterations, and a hymn by one writer, founded upon the earlier work of another, from which he has drawn his materials, but has recast them, as by a new and original effort. In these cases success is possible, though not easy, if the later writer has himself attained to a real enthusiasm, so as to make the work his own, and lose the copyist in the poet. Of such success our hymnody supplies several examples: perhaps the best is Cameron's beautiful hymn, in the Scotch paraphrases, "*How bright these glorious spirits shine!*" which is derived from one by Watts.

19. Having so far explained the principles which I think ought to be kept in view in hymnals for Church use, and having stated my reasons for preferring generally vernacular English hymns to translations, I propose, during the rest of this lecture, to give a short sketch of the rise and progress of our native hymnody, and of the characteristic qualities of some of its principal authors. Some idea of the multitude of hymns extant in our language may perhaps be formed, when it is stated, that the compositions published under that designation (or as Psalms not translated) by eight authors only, (Watts, Simon Browne, Doddridge, Charles Wesley, Newton, Beddome, Kelly, and James Montgomery), number about 6,500: and that in 1861 Mr. Sedgwick (to whom all English hymnologists are under great obligations) published a catalogue of 618 authors of original English hymns, (72 of them also translators,) besides 53 who were translators only.

20. The hymn-writers most worthy of note with whom I am acquainted, from the Reformation till the end of the seventeenth century, are the anonymous Roman Catholic author of the New Jerusalem hymn of the time of Queen Elizabeth, which, as amplified by David Dickson, is well known and popular in Scotland; and Wither, Crossman, Austin, Jeremy Taylor, Baxter, Mason, Shepherd, and Ken;—all (except the Elizabethan author, and Austin, who was also a Roman Catholic) all bred in the Church of England; though Baxter and Shepherd, after holding benefices, became Nonconformists. Wither published, in the reign of Charles I., 233 hymns for the Festivals of the Church and other occasions. Crossman's "*Divine Poems*" (three in number, appended to his *Young Man's Calling*); Austin's "*Offices*" for private devotion, containing about forty hymns; a small number of hymns (in uncouth metres, not fit for singing) by Bishop Taylor; Baxter's "*Poetical Fragments*," including about twenty-eight hymns; Mason's forty-one "*Songs of Praise*;" and Bishop Ken's three well-known hymns, for Morning, Evening, and Midnight, are all of the time of Charles the II. Shepherd's thirty "*Penitential Cries*" appeared about three years after the Revolution.

21. The works of these writers were not intended for congregational use; and very few of them are at all well adapted for it. Abridgements, however, from Ken's Morning and Evening Hymns have long been, and (probably) will always continue to be, popular: and a portion of one by Baxter (generally more or less varied)

deservedly finds a place in most of our hymnals. The following stanzas by Crossman are extremely fine, and not unsuitable for general use:—

Jerusalem on high
My song and City is,
My home whene'er I die,
The centre of my bliss :
O happy place !
When shall I be,
My God, with Thee,
To see Thy face ?

Thy walls, sweet City, thine,
With pearls are garnished ;
Thy gates with praises shine,
Thy streets with gold are spread :
O happy place ! &c.

No sun by day shines there,
Nor moon by silent night ;
Oh no ! these needless are ;
The Lamb's the City's Light.
O happy place ! &c.

There dwells my Lord, my King,
Judged here unfit to live ;
There angels to Him sing,
And lowly homage give.
O happy place ! &c.

The Patriarchs of old
There from their travels cease ;
The Prophets there behold
Their longed-for Prince of Peace.
O happy place ! &c.

The Lamb's Apostles there
I might with joy behold :
The Harpers I might hear
Harping on harps of gold.
O happy place, &c.

The bleeding Martyrs, they
Within those courts are found,
Clothed in pure array,
Their scars with glory crown'd.
O happy place, &c.

Ah me ! ah me ! that I
In Kedar's tents here stay !
No place like this on high !
Thither, Lord, guide my way !
O happy place ! &c.

(SUNG BY THE CHOIR.)

Austin is a graceful and poetical writer, with few Roman Catholic peculiarities: his best contribution to our hymn-books is the following:

Blest by Thy love, dear Lord,
That taught us this sweet way,
Only to love Thee for Thyself,
And for that love obey.

O Thou, our soul's chief hope!
 We to Thy mercy fly;
 Where'er we are, Thou canst protect,
 Whate'er we need, supply.

Whether we sleep or wake,
 To Thee we both resign;
 By night we see, as well as day,
 If Thy light on us shine.

Whether we live or die,
 Both we submit to Thee;
 In death we live, as well as life,
 If Thine in death we be.

Mason's "Songs of Praise," though disfigured by quaintness, amounting to the grotesque, have in them a very fine vein of poetry: and later writers have dug out of them much pure ore. One hymn at least, fit for general use—

There is a Stream, which issues forth
 From God's eternal throne, &c.

may be taken from them without any change of text.

Besides the hymns of these writers, another worthy of note, the popular Christmas Hymn beginning, "*While shepherds watched their flocks by night*," was published, in the "Supplement" to the New Version of the Psalms, by Tate and Brady: to whose general style its severe simplicity bears no resemblance.

22. At the commencement of the eighteenth century, the name of Addison stands apart. He cannot be classed either with the earlier hymn-writers already mentioned, or with those of whom we shall presently speak. Five hymns only are attributed to him; four of them certainly are his; all are well known; all are graceful and popular; though the style of one, "*When, rising from the bed of death*," is so much more homely than that of the rest as to suggest a doubt whether it can really be from the same hand. Three of them, (that, and the hymns founded on the 19th and 23rd Psalms,) are justly esteemed, and generally used in our churches. The other two are of a more private and personal character.

23. The rest of the hymns of the eighteenth century may be divided into (1) those which proceeded from the Independent or Baptist Nonconformists in England; and the Presbyterian body in England and Scotland; and (2) those which are due to the great Methodist movement.

24. The Independents, as represented by Dr. Watts, have a just claim to be considered the real founders of modern English hymnody. Watts was the first to understand the nature of the want; and by the publication of his "Hymns" in 1709, and "Psalms" in 1719, he led the way in providing for it. His immediate followers were Simon Browne and Doddridge. Later in the century, Hart, Gibbons, Grigg, and Mrs. Barbauld (the two first Independents, the two last Presbyterians,) and Miss Steele, Medley, Stennett, Ryland, Beddome, and Swaine (all Baptists,) with other less copious writers, succeeded to them. With these may be classed the authors of the Scotch Para-

phrases, adapted by the General Assembly in 1745, and enlarged about thirty years afterwards; some of which are variations from hymns by Doddridge and Watts, and others original works, chiefly by Scottish Presbyterian ministers.

25. Among these writers (most of whom have produced hymns of merit), Watts and Doddridge are pre-eminent. It is the fashion with some to disparage Watts, as if he had never risen above the level of his "Hymns for Little Children." No doubt his taste is often faulty, and his style very unequal: he shares with the majority of hymn-writers (as well as epigrammatists) the censure, *Sunt bona, sunt quædam mediocria, sunt mala plura.* But, looking to the good, and disregarding the baser matter, I cannot dissemble my opinion, that more hymns which approach to a very high standard of excellence may be found in his works than in those of any other single writer in the English language. I have already spoken of one masterpiece, "*When I survey the wondrous Cross.*" Another, almost equally popular, is a hymn founded on the 72nd Psalm. How excellent are the four first stanzas:—

Jesus shall reign where'er the sun
Does his successive journeys run;
His kingdom stretch from shore to shore,
Till moons shall wax and wane no more.

For Him shall endless prayer be made,
And praises throng to crown His Head;
His Name, like sweet perfume, shall rise
With every morning sacrifice.

People and realms of every tongue
Dwell on His love with sweetest song;
And infant voices shall proclaim
Their early blessings on His Name.

Blessings abound where'er He reigns;
The prisoner leaps, to lose his chains;
The weary find eternal rest,
And all the sons of want are blest.

(SUNG BY THE CHOIR.)

Another of his hymns, from the same Psalm, is not equally well known; yet what can be better than these lines:—

As rain on meadows newly mown,
So shall He send His influence down:
His grace on fainting souls distills,
Like heavenly dew on thirsty hills.

The heathen lands, that lie beneath
The shade of overspreading death,
Revive at His first dawning light,
And deserts blossom at the sight.

The saints shall flourish in His days,
Dress'd in the robes of joy and praise:
Peace, like a river, from His Throne
Shall flow to nations yet unknown.

As long as pure nervous English, unaffected fervour, strong simplicity,

and liquid yet manly sweetness, are admitted to be characteristics of a good hymn, works like these must surely command admiration.

Doddridge is much more laboured and artificial. But his place, also, as a hymn-writer, ought to be determined, not by his failures, but by his successes, of which the number is not inconsiderable. In his better works he is distinguished by a graceful and pointed, and sometimes even by a noble, style. Of the latter, the hymn, "*Hark, the glad sound!*" (already quoted for a different purpose) is a fine example. The following well represents his softer manner:—

How gentle God's commands,
How kind His precepts are;
Come, cast your burdens on the Lord,
And trust His constant care.

While Providence supports,
Let saints securely dwell:
That Hand, which bears all Nature up,
Shall guide His children well.

Why should this anxious load
Press down your weary mind?
Haste to your Heavenly Father's throne
And sweet refreshment find.

His goodness stands approved
Down to the present day:
I'll drop my burden at His feet,
And bear a song away.

Of the other writers named under this division, Miss Steele is the most popular, and (perhaps) the best. Her hymn beginning, "*Far from these narrow scenes of night,*" deserves high praise, even by the side of other good performances upon the same subject.

26. We now come to the hymns due to the Methodist movement, which began about 1738, and which afterwards became divided, between those esteemed Arminian, under John Wesley; those who adhered to the Moravians, when the original alliance between that body and the founders of Methodism was dissolved; and the Calvinists, of whom Whitfield was the leader, and Selina, Countess of Huntingdon, the patroness.

Each of these sections had its own hymn-writers. The Wesleyans had Charles Wesley, Seagrave, Olivers, and Bakewell; the Moravians, Cennick and Hammond; the Calvinists, Toplady, Berridge, William Williams, Madan, Batty, Haweis, Rowland Hill, John Newton, and Cowper. Of these, all but Olivers, Bakewell, Cennick, and Batty (who were Methodist preachers), and Cowper, a layman, were ordained clergymen of the Church of England. Charles Wesley wrote "*Presbyter of the Church of England*" upon the titlepage of his latest works; and Toplady, Berridge, Newton, and Haweis died incumbents of benefices, though maintaining intimate relations with Lady Huntingdon, (who was always averse to any breach with the Church), and the ministers of her connexion.

27. Among all these writers, the palm, undoubtedly belongs to Charles Wesley. In the first volume of hymns published by the two

brothers are several good translations from the German, believed to be by John Wesley; who, although he translated and adapted, is not supposed to have written any original hymns; and the influence of German hymnody (probably through their early connexion with Count Zinzendorf) may be traced in a large proportion of Charles Wesley's works. He is more subjective and meditative than Watts and his school; there is a meditative turn even in his most objective pieces, (as, for example, in his Christmas and Easter hymns); most of his works are supplicatory; and his faults are connected with the same habit of mind. He is apt to repeat the same thoughts, and to lose force by redundancy; he runs, sometimes, even to a tedious length: his hymns are not always symmetrically constructed, or well balanced and finished off. But he has great truth, depth, and variety of feeling. His diction is manly, and always to the point; never florid, though sometimes passionate, and not free from exaggeration; often vivid and picturesque. Of his spirited style I know no better examples than the stanzas beginning—

O for a thousand tongues to sing
My dear Redeemer's praise;

and the noble hymn,

Come let us join our friends above,
Who have obtained the prize.

Of his fervid contemplative style, (confining myself to hymns fit for general adoption), the following is a late, but very characteristic, specimen:—

O Thou, who camest from above,
The pure celestial fire t' impart,
Kindle a flame of sacred love
On the mean altar of my heart.

There let it for Thy glory burn
With inextinguishable blaze.
And, trembling, to its source return
In humble prayer and fervent praise.

Jesus! confirm my heart's desire
To work, and speak, and think for Thee;
Still let me guard the holy fire,
And still stir up Thy gift in me;

Ready for all Thy perfect will,
My acts of faith and love repeat,
Till death Thy endless mercies seal,
And make my sacrifice complete.

Of the other Wesleyan hymn-writers, Olivers (originally a Welsh shoemaker, afterwards a preacher,) is the most remarkable. He is the author of only two works, both of which are odes, scarcely (if at all) fit for singing; but one of them, "*The God of Abraham praise,*" is an ode of singular power and beauty.

28. The Moravian Methodists produced few hymns now available

for general use. The best of them are Cennick's "*Children of the Heavenly King*," and Hammond's

Awake, and sing the song
Of Moses and the Lamb;

the former of which (in an abridged form), and the latter (as varied by Madan), are found in most hymn-books, and are deservedly esteemed.

29. The contributions of the Calvinistic Methodists to our hymnody are of greater extent and value. Toplady's "*Rock of Ages*" is, perhaps, the best hymn in the English language. Berridge, Williams, and Rowland Hill, though not the authors of many good hymns, each composed some of great merit. Take for examples Williams's "*Guide me, O Thou great Jehovah*," Rowland Hill's "*Exalted high at God's right hand*," and the following, by Berridge, from the 131st Psalm:—

Jesus, cast a look on me;
Give me sweet simplicity,
Make me poor and keep me low,
Seeking only Thee to know;

Weanèd from my lordly self,
Weanèd from the miser's pelf,
Weanèd from the scorner's ways,
Weanèd from the lust of praise.

All that feeds my busy pride,
Cast it evermore aside;
Bid my will to Thine submit;
Lay me humbly at Thy feet.

Make me like a little child,
Of my strength and wisdom spoil'd,
Seeing only in Thy light,
Walking only in thy might,

Leaning on Thy loving breast,
Where a weary soul may rest
Feeling well the peace of God
Flowing from Thy precious Blood.

In this posture let me live,
And hosannas daily give:
In this temper let me die,
And hosannas ever cry!

(SUNG BY THE CHOIR.)

If, however, the number as well as the quality of good hymns available for general use is to be regarded, the authors of the Olney Hymns are entitled to be placed at the head of the writers of this Calvinistic school. The tenderness of Cowper, and the manliness of Newton, give the interest of contrast, as well as that of sustained reality, to the Olney Hymns. If Newton carried to some excess the sound principle laid down by him, that "perspicuity, simplicity, and ease should be chiefly attended to; and the imagery and colouring of poetry, if admitted at all, should be indulged very sparingly and with

great judgment;" if he is often dry and colloquial; he rises at other times into "soul-animating strains," such as

Glorious things of thee are spoken,
Zion, City of our God!

and sometimes rivals Cowper himself in his depth of feeling. Of the two following hymns, both characteristic, and both of first-rate excellence, it is not easy to say which is the best.

(1.) The first is by Newton.

Approach, my soul, the mercy-seat,
Where Jesus answers prayer;
There humbly fall before His feet,
For none can perish there.

Thy promise is my only plea,
With this I venture nigh;
Thou callest burden'd souls to Thee,
And such, O Lord, am I.

Bow'd down beneath a load of sin,
By Satan sorely prest,
By war without, and fears within,
I come to Thee for rest.

Be Thou my Shield and Hiding-place,
That, shelter'd near Thy side,
I may my fierce accuser face,
And tell him, Thou hast died.

O wondrous love! to bleed and die,
To bear the cross and shame,
That guilty sinners, such as I,
Might plead Thy gracious Name!

(SUNG BY THE CHOIR.)

(2.) Now let us hear Cowper.

Hark, my soul! it is the Lord,
'Tis thy Saviour, hear His word:
Jesus speaks, and speaks to thee;
"Say, poor sinner, lov'st thou me?"

"I delivered thee when bound,
And, when bleeding, heal'd thy wound;
Sought thee wandering, set thee right,
Turn'd thy darkness into light.

"Can a woman's tender care
Cease towards the child she bare?
Yes, she may forgetful be;
Yet will I remember thee.

"Mine is an unchanging love,
Higher than the heights above,
Deeper than the depths beneath,
Free and faithful, strong as death.

"Thou shalt see My glory soon,
When the work of grace is done ;
Partner of My throne shalt be ;
Say, poor sinner, lov'st thou Me?"

Lord ! it is my chief complaint,
That my love is weak and faint ;
Yet I love Thee and adore—
Oh for grace to love Thee more !

30. We have now arrived at the present century, in which the honours of hymnody are again divided between Nonconformists and members of the Church of England. Beginning with the Nonconformists, their chief writers are Kelly (the son of an Irish Judge, ordained in the Established Church, but who afterwards seceded), and the Moravian poet, James Montgomery. Among those of less name, Conder, the author of the fine hymn beginning—

The Lord is King ! lift up thy voice,
O earth, and all ye heavens, rejoice,

is the most conspicuous.

Kelly and Montgomery are both copious writers, who began to publish hymns at the very commencement of the century ; and both, having lived to a great age, died in the same year, 1854. Of the two, Kelly is more simple and natural, Montgomery the more cultivated and artistic. Kelly, without the vivacity and terseness of Watts or the severity of Newton, has some points in common with both those writers ; and he has the merit, if such it be, of being less subjective than most writers of the Methodist school, and preferring the first person plural to the first person singular. Some of his lines dwell long upon the memory, and dignify works not otherwise remarkable : as in the hymn, "*O Israel, to thy tents repair*;" the noble stanza—

Thou should'st not sleep, as others do :
Awake ! be vigilant, be brave !
The coward, and the sluggish too,
Must wear the fetters of the slave.

His hymns beginning, "*Lo ! He comes, let all adore Him !*" and "*Through the day Thy love hath spared us,*" have a rich melodious movement ; and the following is distinguished by a calm subdued power, rising gradually from a rather low to a very high key—

We sing the praise of Him who died,
Of Him who died upon the Cross :
The sinner's hope let men deride,
For this we count the world but loss.

Inscribed upon the Cross we see
In shining letters, God is love ;
He bears our sins upon the Tree,
He brings us mercy from above.

The Cross ! it takes our guilt away ;
It holds the fainting spirit up :
It cheers with hope the gloomy day,
And sweetens every bitter cup.

It makes the coward spirit brave,
And nerves the feeble arm for fight;
It takes its terror from the grave,
And gilds the bed of death with light;

The balm of life, the cure of woe;
The measure and the pledge of love;
The sinner's refuge here below;
The angels' theme in heaven above.

I doubt whether Montgomery ever wrote anything quite equal to this; but some of his hymns (such as "*Hail to the Lord's Anointed*") are extremely good: others, if not absolutely first-rate, are entitled to a high place in the second rank; and the number of his valuable contributions to our hymnals is, upon the whole, considerable.

31. To the hymn-writers of the Church of England in the present century (and especially to some of those who are no longer among us, Bishop Heber, Sir Robert Grant, Bowdler, Marriott, Keble, Kyte, Bishop Mant, Anstice, and Neale,) belongs the praise of having reclaimed British Hymnody from being the exclusive possession of particular schools or parties, and having relieved it from those prejudices to which (in the minds of many) its association with the idea of sect or party was sure to lead, and had actually led.

32. I shall not attempt to discriminate, or to weigh with accuracy, the merits of these authors. If I may compare them, generally, with those whom I have endeavoured to pass under review, I should be tempted to say, (not applying the criticism to all, and especially not applying it to Mr. Keble,) that while they have brought to the composition of hymns the grace and refinement, and the artistic skill, characteristic of cultivated taste and elegant scholarship, avoiding undue familiarity and the other faults to which an artless enthusiasm is usually liable, they fall, upon the whole, below the best works of their predecessors in the great qualities of simplicity and strength. Sir Robert Grant, Bowdler, and Bishop Mant are too florid and elaborate: in the musical flow and pleasing facility of Bishop Heber's verses, sound sometimes appears to lead the sense: and the tenderness of Lyte, Anstice, and some others whom I could name, is almost feminine. Allowing, however, for these drawbacks, we still owe to these writers many admirable works. They come too near to ourselves and to our own time to be at present impartially judged. But I cannot persuade myself that the time will ever come when such hymns as Heber's "*The Son of God goes forth to war*," "*Hosanna to the living Lord*," and "*From Greenland's icy mountains*," or Lyte's "*Pleasant are Thy courts above*," and "*Abide with me; fast falls the eventide*," or Keble's "*Sun of my soul, Thou Saviour dear*," and "*The voice which breathed o'er Eden*," will be less popular than they are with ourselves.

33. Of writers still living, (the names of many, and of some very eminent, will at once occur to my hearers,) I do not feel called upon to make myself, in this place, either the critic or the eulogist. But I may be permitted to say, that the most favourable hopes may be entertained of the future prospects of British Hymnody, when among its most recent fruits is a work so admirable in every respect as the

Epiphany Hymn of Mr. Chatterton Dix; than which there can be no more appropriate conclusion to this lecture—

As with gladness men of old
Did the guiding star behold;
As with joy they hailed its light,
Leading onward, beaming bright;
So, most gracious God, may we
Evermore be led to Thee.

As with joyful steps they sped
To that lowly manger-bed,
There to bend the knee before
Him whom Heaven and Earth adore;
So may we with willing feet
Ever seek Thy mercy-seat.

As they offered gifts most rare
At that manger rude and bare,
So may we with holy joy
Pure, and free from sin's alloy,
All our costliest treasures bring,
Christ, to Thee, our Heavenly King.

Holy Jesus! every day
Keep us in the narrow way;
And, when earthly things are past,
Bring our ransomed souls at last
Where they need no star to guide,
Where no clouds Thy glory hide.

In the heavenly country bright
Need they no created light;
Thou its Light, its Joy, its Crown,
Thou its Sun, which goes not down.
There for ever may we sing
Alleluias to our King.

(SUNG BY THE CHOIR.)

CONCLUSION.

The Lord Bishop of CHESTER: I hope your Grace will accept my appearance on this occasion as an example of dutiful obedience on the part of one of your suffragans. I am to ask this great meeting to express its sense of the value of a sermon which unfortunately I had not the opportunity of hearing. Almost every one about me is better qualified to move such a proposition than I am, but I submit to your Grace's commands without murmuring, since the result will be to enable me to partake of the gratification which I hear expressed on every side. It was a singular advantage to the Congress, presided over by one Archbishop, to be honoured with the presence of the other as preacher, and this advantage is largely augmented on the present occasion by the respect and esteem universally entertained in this Province for his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury. It is not for me to take up your time with any commendations of one so thoroughly well known and beloved. I will, therefore, at once propose the resolution which has been placed in my hands:—"That the grateful and

most respectful thanks of this Congress be presented to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury for his sermon in the Minster, and that his Grace be requested to allow the same to be printed in the Report."

The Bishop of NORTH CAROLINA: As one of those who did hear and profit by the Archbishop's sermon, I am thankful to second the motion of the Right Reverend Prelate. Among the precious memories which the American Bishops will carry from a meeting where we have found so cordial and brotherly a reception, the Archbishop of Canterbury's sermon will hold a foremost place. I need not commend what your Grace has already spoken of as a wise and loving discourse. Neither the sermon nor the place where it was delivered will be easily forgotten by my brethren or myself. We shall carry back to the United States a most grateful impression of the kindness we have received from all classes—the Archbishops, Bishops, Clergy, and Laity of this great Congress. The gratitude acknowledged in the Preface to our Book of Common Prayer to the Church of England "for the first foundation, and a long continuance of nursing care and protection," is sincerely felt in the heart of every American Churchman; it will be deepened and enlarged by the hand of fellowship extended to us at this most interesting meeting. I pray your Grace and the Congress to accept our heartfelt thanks.

The motion was put from the chair, and carried by acclamation.

The Earl of DEVON moved "That the thanks of this Congress be tendered to the Dean and Chapter of York, and to the Churchmen of Yorkshire, for their liberality in erecting this commodious hall for the use of the Congress."

The Right Hon. JOSEPH NAPIER seconded the motion, which was put and carried.

The Earl NELSON moved "That the Congress cordially thank the Rt. Hon. the Lord Mayor of York, the Corporation, and inhabitants of this ancient city, for the hearty welcome they have received, and for the good old Yorkshire hospitality extended to this numerous meeting."

Archdeacon MUSGRAVE seconded the motion, which was carried.

The LORD MAYOR returned thanks, and after alluding in particular to the admirable address with which the Archbishop had inaugurated this most successful Congress, and his appropriate and happy opening of the working men's meeting, expressed his hope that stalwart as the Archbishop's frame appeared to be (applause), he (the Lord Mayor) trusted that his Grace would, in his unwearying exertions, be careful not to overtax his physical strength. The Lord Mayor concluded with an earnest wish that a life so valuable to the Church and the world would be long spared, and moved that the cordial and respectful thanks of the Congress be presented to the Archbishop for his dignified courtesy, kindness, and unvaried impartiality in the chair. (Cheers.)

The LORD BISHOP OF RIPON: The reception which has already been given to this resolution sufficiently proves that it needs no seconder, but I should be wanting in the duty which has been intrusted to my care if I did not express my conviction that it is an act of the merest justice that we should pass such a resolution as this. I consider that it is no easy matter to preside successfully over such a Congress as that which has been assembled in this ancient city. A Church Congress would scarcely be of any value if it did not bring together men of every shade of thought and feeling that exist in the Church of England. I conceive that it is no little advantage to be derived from Congresses such as this, that, bringing together as they do men of all shades of thought and feeling, we are able to discern points of agreement which, perhaps, if we had stood at a distance from each other, we should little have thought existed. We learn also from them to see that some of the differences that do exist had been magnified, and that points of apparently great importance which formerly divided us are in reality of comparative insignificance. I believe that truth is elicited from the conflict of thought and opinion; but it must be evident that where such differences exist it is no easy matter to preside. I think, however, that those who have witnessed the proceedings of this Congress must unanimously concur in the opinion that your Grace has presided over our deliberations with a tact, a courtesy, a kindness, and a forbearance towards all that must command our admiration and deserve our gratitude. I may be permitted also to say that in adopting this resolution—as I know it will be adopted unanimously by this large assembly—I feel that a debt of gratitude is due to your Grace not only for what you have done during our deliberations of the present week, but for the care and forethought which you have manifested for months past to ensure the success of this Congress. Not only did your Grace interpose no check to the proposition to hold the Congress in this venerable city, but from the first moment when it was determined that this Congress should take place in York you have never spared your labour, your thought, or your wise suggestions in order to bring the proposal to a happy and pros-

perous issue. May I be allowed to congratulate your Grace upon the happy termination of your labours? I now call upon this assembly with one heart and voice to adopt this resolution, which offers to your Grace our most cordial thanks for the dignity, courtesy, kindness, and undeniable impartiality which you have manifested in the chair.

The resolution was passed with loud cheers, the whole assembly rising.

HIS GRACE THE PRESIDENT: I expected, no doubt, the usual vote of thanks to the chairman by which, rather unjustly I think, he is supposed to appropriate all the credit which really belongs to many; but such a reception as I have just received I confess I did not expect. I must be permitted to say that I regard it less as a formality than as the utterance of dear friends, and I do not think I shall forget it as long as I live. We have now come to the final proceeding connected with this Congress. I regret it, but I should regret it much more did I think that there would not be a great and permanent result from our gathering. Before, however, I speak of that, let me clear off one or two debts, without which this proceeding would be incomplete. I beg you to observe that though I have given my surplus time to this work, and have given also such thought to it as I could spare from other duties, there are a great many gentlemen who have given to it days and nights; and without whose great exertions the thing could not have been compassed at all. It was a moment of deep anxiety and dismay when we discovered that though we had asked a great number of guests to York, we had no place in which to put them; and it was only through the very great exertions of the Executive Committee, the secretaries, and other persons that the difficulty was overcome, and that we have been enabled to meet here as we have. We have said a great deal about Churchmen; but Churchwomen have been a little left out of the account. It is, however, only fair to say that they have had some share of the work. The decorations which hang round the gallery, and which are symbols of the various sees of the Church of England at home and abroad, are the gift of Churchwomen. When we tear down this building we shall not rudely tear down those decorations, but we shall carefully preserve them, as the gift of the Churchwomen of York, for use at future Congresses. Another debt, and it is not the least, I must also discharge. We have listened this evening to a lecture of singular felicity. The distinguished person who delivered it, as you know, is a person of many gifts. If he had come into this Section at an earlier hour to-day, he would have been able to elucidate abstruse points of law, and to throw a strong light upon the subject which occupied our attention this morning. If he had wandered into the Section on Adult and Sunday Schools he would have been equally at home. For eleven years he stood to me in the relations of lay parishioner and parish minister; and though his daily labours were greater than few of us could imagine, still on Sunday my friend never failed to enter the Sunday School and there apply the tact and skill which you have witnessed to-night to the difficult task of keeping in order a class of boys who were rather too old for school, and who would otherwise have gone adrift from us. I am exceedingly glad that he did neither of these things; but that he has reserved himself for what he has done to-night. It is no ordinary treat which he has given us, and during the course of his lecture I could not help feeling some emotion. It was a most happy thought that after all the discussions of this Congress, and after all the differences and strife to which they might have led, we should conclude our proceedings with our faces, as it were, turned up to heaven. It was, I say, a most felicitous thought, and there was no one who could have guided us better to those thoughts which one would wish this night to cultivate. Our work being now done, let us gather up what remains. Surely the impressions of to-night remain. Surely some impressions of last night also remain. Last night was, in fact, the most important step which has yet been taken in the history of this movement. I am not aware of any case precisely like it, where a number of working people—men who live by the work of their hands—gave up the rest which they so much needed, and remained for hours listening with attention—for a more orderly meeting was never witnessed—listening with the most complete attention (for I watched their faces) to exactly those things which one would most wish should reach their hearts. It would be impossible to say, even if that meeting stood alone, that the results of this Congress could perish or be forgotten. But more than that remains with us. We have discussed the whole field of Christian action. We have turned over every one of the great practical questions which belong to the Church. I do not care much for them as matters of discussion. Discussion there must be, but we have had our eyes turned to that which is the source of life to the Church. What is it, I ask, that makes men such as we are, gather together in great numbers to see what can be done to improve the condition of the working people of

this country? What is it that brings together pious women who, though nurtured in every kind of refinement, devote themselves to that which in a physical sense is most revolting, by the bed-side of the sick and miserable? What is it that sets us discussing the subject of schools? What is it that makes us vehement about what seems to us a good cause? It is the constraining love of Christ. Again I say, let us forget the discussions and the strife;—but let us remember that these discussions prove life, and show that we feel love towards young souls, and wish to see them grow up in the knowledge of their Redeemer. I look around this building, and I think it may be regarded in some sense as a type of our life. This building has sprung up in six weeks. We have spent three days in it, I trust not without some profit, and I hope we shall carry away with us burning in our hearts new ideas and new aspirations. But in a few days this building will be taken down. The ground on which it stands will be carefully levelled. All will disappear as by magic, and nothing will be left between earth and heaven. Yes, there will be something left between earth and heaven. There will be left these things which we have been doing. There will be the interest which we have taken in the poor and helpless. There will be our self-denial in putting aside our own ease and going to sick beds and hospitals. That will remain, because it is not earthly—because it is the result of no natural causation, but because it is a mark of the presence of our Saviour; because it is of God Himself and will be eternal as God. It is so with our life. It is a house which we inhabit for a few days, and after that it is dissolved and disappears, and nothing remains but the green earth on which we sleep, and the heaven which is the home of the soul. Yes; there, too, something more remains. The efforts we have made for God and Christ, the words we have spoken for Him, the good we have done in His name, abide and engender other good things. In conclusion, let me thank you once more for all the indulgence which has been shown me, and particularly for the great warmth which has been manifested towards me this evening. I repeat, I shall not forget it. I proposed to myself at the outset that I would be, as far as in my power lay, strictly impartial in filling this office and in moderating between men of different opinions. If any one thinks that I cannot claim the praise of having done this, I humbly ask his pardon, and beg to assure him that it is only the weakness of human nature that has been the cause of my failure. My friends, I heartily bid you farewell! The best thing that I can wish for any future Congress and future President is that it may be as unanimous and its members as indulgent as those who have frequented this meeting. I heartily wish you farewell.

HIS GRACE the PRESIDENT then pronounced the Benediction.

REV. CANON ATLAY. (Page 120.)

APPENDIX A.

From Stephens's *Ecclesiastical Statutes*; p. 188.

STAT. 26 HENRICI 8, c. 14 (1). A.D. 1534.

“For Nomination of Suffragans, and Consecration of them.”

“Albeit that sithen the beginning of this present parliament, good and honourable ordinances and statutes have been made and established for elections, presentations, consecrations, and investing of archbishops and bishops of this realm, and in all other the king's dominions, with all ceremonies appertaining unto the same, as by sundry statutes thereof made more at large is specified; yet nevertheless *no provision hitherto hath been made* (2) for suffragans, which have been accustomed to be had (3) within this realm, *for the more speedy administration* (4) of the sacraments, and other good, wholesome, and devout things, and laudable ceremonies, to the increase of God's honour, and for the commodity of good and devout people: be it therefore enacted by authority of this present parliament, that the towns of Thetford, Ipswich, Colchester, Dover, Guildford, Southampton, Taunton, Shaftsbury, Moiton, Marlborough, Bedford, Leiester, Glocester, Shresbury, Bristow, Penreth, Bridgwater, Nottingham, Grantham, Hull, Huntington, Cambridge, and the towns of Pereth and Berwick, S. Germans in Cornwal, and the Isle of Wight, shall be taken and accepted for sees of bishops suffragans to be made in this realm, and in Wales, and the bishops of such sees shall be called suffragans of this realm; and that every archbishop and bishop of this realm, and of Wales, and elsewhere within the king's dominions, being disposed to have any suffragan, shall and may at their liberties name and elect, that is to say, every of them for their peculiar diocese, two honest and discreet spiritual persons, being learned, and of good conversation,

By whom suffragans shall be nominated and appointed. 25 Hen. 8, c. 20.

Sees for the suffragan bishops.

The bishop shall present two persons to the king for his suffragans.

(1) Repealed by Stat. 1 & 2 P. & M. c. 8. Revived by Stat. 1 Eliz. c. 1, and Stat. 8 Eliz. c. 1.

(2) *No provision hitherto hath been made*:—That is, by act of parliament, as had been for archbishops and bishops by Stat. 25 Hen. 8, c. 20; ante 153.

(3) *Accustomed to be had*:—These were the same with the ancient chorepiscopi, or bishops of the country; so called by way of distinction from the proper bishops of the city or see; and who were very common in England, taking their titles from places *in partibus infidelium*, or from places in which (though there were settled sees, and they had been ordained to them,) they could not remain with safety; and upon this account several Irish bishops from time to time were received and acted as suffragans, under English bishops. Archbishop Peckham, by a particular instrument, required the Bishop of Lichfield, in consideration of his infirmities, to provide a suffragan, and it is mentioned, because the same instrument expresses the duties of an English suffragan: “Qui circumeat, prædicando, ecclesias dedicando, virgines consecrando, ordines celebrando, parvulos confirmando et alia exequendo, quæ ad episcopale officium requiruntur;” which last clause is to be understood

The king's
allowance of a
suffragan.

and those two persons so by them to be named; shall present to the king's highness, by their writing under their seals, making humble request to his majesty, to give to one such of the said two persons as shall please his majesty, such title, name, stile, and dignity of bishop of such of the sees above specified, as the king's highness shall think most convenient for the same; and that the king's majesty, upon every such presentation, shall have full power and authority to give to one of those two persons so to his highness to be presented, the stile, title, and name of a bishop of such of the sees aforesaid, as to his majesty shall be thought most convenient and expedient, so it be within the same province whereof the bishop that doth name him is.

"II. And that every such person to whom the king's highness shall give any such stile and title of any of the sees aforesaid, shall be called bishop suffragan of the same see whereunto he shall be named.

The king
presenteth the
suffragan to the
archbishop.

"III. And after such title, stile, and name so given as is aforesaid, the king's majesty shall present every such person, by his letters patents under his great seal, to the Archbishop of Canterbury, if the town whereof he hath his title be within the province of Canterbury, and likewise to the Archbishop of York, if the town whereof he hath his title be within the province of York, signifying and declaring by the same letters patents, the name of the person presented, and the stile and title of dignity of the bishoprick whereunto he shall be nominated, requiring the same *archbishop* (1) to whom such letters patents shall be directed, to consecrate the said person so nominate and presented to the same name, title, stile and dignity of bishop, that he shall be nominated and presented unto, and to give him all such *consecrations*, benedictions, and ceremonies, as to the degree and office of a bishop suffragan shall be requisite.

Within what
time after the
king's pre-
sentation the
archbishop
shall consecrate
a suffragan.

"IV. And be it also enacted by authority aforesaid, that all and every such person and persons as shall be nominated, elected, presented, and consecrated, as is afore rehearsed, shall be taken, accepted, and reputed, in all degrees and places, according to the stile, title, name, and dignity, that he shall be so presented unto,

with a limitation, *viz.* as to what concerned the episcopal office, and its exercise; because the jurisdiction and temporalities (in case of the infirmities of a bishop in body or mind) were put under the management of a coadjutor, (*vide post* Stat. 1 Eliz. c. 1, *in not.*) constituted by the archbishop.

(4) *For the more speedy administration*:—In King Charles the Second's declaration touching ecclesiastical affairs, immediately before his restoration, one head is as follows: "Because the dioceses, especially some of them, are thought to be of too large extent, we will appoint such a number of suffragan bishops in every diocese, as shall be sufficient for the due performance of their work."

(1) *Archbishop*:—By the canon law, the consecration was to be by the bishop: "A quo consecrabitur iste episcopus? Respondeo, à suo episcopo, non à metropolitano (cum ei non subsit) adjunctis sibi duobus vicinis episcopis — et illi tenentur venire ad advocacionem illius, quia sibi invicem mutuum consilium et auxilium exhibere tenentur." Extra. l. i., t. 31, c. 14, v. *Vicarum*.

and have such capacity, power, and authority, honour, pre-eminence, and reputation, in as large and ample manner, in and concerning the execution of such commission as by any of the said archbishops or bishops within their diocese shall be given to the said suffragans, as to suffragans of this realm heretofore hath been used and accustomed.

“V. And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, that every archbishop of this realm, to whom any the king's letters patents, in the cases afore rehearsed, shall be directed, having no lawful impediment, shall perform and accomplish the effects and contents of this act within the time of three months next after such letters patents shall come to their hands; any usages, customs, foreign laws, privileges, prescriptions, or other thing or things heretofore used, had, or done to the contrary hereof notwithstanding.

“VI. Provided always, that no such suffragans, which shall be made and consecrate by virtue and authority of this act, shall take or perceive any manner of profits of the places and sees whereof they shall be named, nor use, have, or execute any jurisdiction, or episcopal power, or authority, within their said sees, nor within any diocese or place of this realm, or elsewhere within the king's dominions, but only such profits, jurisdiction, power, and authority, as shall be licenced and limited to them to take, do, and execute, by any archbishop or bishop of this realm, within their diocese to whom they shall be suffragans, by their commission under their seals; and that every archbishop and bishop of this realm, for their own peculiar diocese, may and shall give such commission or commissions to every such bishop suffragan as shall be so consecrate by authority of this act, as hath been accustomed for suffragans heretofore to have, or else such commission as by them shall be thought requisite, reasonable, and convenient; and that no such suffragan shall use any jurisdiction, ordinary or episcopal power, otherwise, nor longer time, than shall be limited by such commission to him to be given as is aforesaid, upon pain to incur into the pains, losses, forfeitures, and penalties, mentioned in the Statute of Provisions, made in the sixteenth year of King Richard the Second.

What authority and benefit suffragans shall have in their dioceses.

“VII. Provided always, that the bishop that shall nominate the suffragan to the king's highness, or the suffragan himself that shall be nominate, shall provide two bishops or suffragans to consecrate him with the archbishop, and shall bear their reasonable costs; provided also, that the residence of him that shall be suffragan over the diocese where he shall have commission, shall serve him for his residence, as sufficiently as if he were resident upon any other his benefice; any act heretofore made to the contrary notwithstanding.

A suffragan's residence over the diocese shall be sufficient for his benefice.

"VIII. Be it further enacted, that all such suffragans as shall hereafter exercise the offices aforesaid, by the commission of the bishop, for the better maintenance of his dignity, may have two benefices with cure; any former act made to the contrary notwithstanding."

A suffragan may have two benefices with cure.
Rep. 1 & 2 P. & M. c. 8, and revised by 1 Eliz. c. 1.

EARL NELSON. (Page 165.)

APPENDIX A.

CANON XXXIX.

Of Lay Readers and Catechists.

"1. Any Bishop may appoint lay readers and catechists to read the Common Prayer and Holy Scriptures in such places within his diocese as he may deem expedient.

"2. Every candidate for this office shall be required to exhibit to the Bishop testimonials from not fewer than two communicants of the Church that he hath lived piously, soberly, and honestly for the space of three years last past, and is a faithful and obedient member of the Church.

"3. Every such candidate shall affix his signature to this canon on his appointment, and he shall submit to all the regulations which the Bishop may prescribe.

"4. The Bishop may cancel his appointment whenever he shall see fit.

"5. Catechists and lay readers shall not minister to the members of existing congregations, except with the consent and under the direction of the incumbents thereof."

APPENDIX B.

At a Meeting of the Bishops, held at Lambeth Palace, on Ascension Day, 1866.—*Present:*

Archbishop of Canterbury	Bishop of Bangor
Archbishop of York	Bishop of Rochester
Archbishop of Armagh	Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol
Bishop of Winchester	Bishop of Peterborough
Bishop of St. David's	Bishop of Ely
Bishop of Oxford	Bishop of Sodor and Mann
Bishop of St. Asaph	Bishop of Derry and Raphoe
Bishop of Llandaff	Bishop of Grahamstown
Bishop of Lincoln	Bishop of Brisbane
Bishop of Ripon	Bishop of Sierra Leone

I.

RESOLVED—

That it is not expedient to alter the Statute or Canon Law with a view of extending the Diaconate to persons engaged in professions or business.

II.

That it is desirable to institute an office of Reader, and that the form of admission to the same be by public prayer and delivery of the New Testament by the Bishop without imposition of hands, and that it be held until the Bishop shall by an instrument under his hand remove the holder therefrom.

III.

That the office be exercised in any particular parish or district under the Bishop's license issued with the written consent of the Incumbent, revocable at the discretion of the Bishop either *mero motu* or at the written request of the Incumbent.

IV.

That the office be unpaid.

V.

That the license of the Bishop empower the Reader:—

1. To render general aid to the clergy in all ministrations not strictly requiring the service of one in Holy Orders.
2. To read Lessons in the Church.
3. To read Prayers and Holy Scripture and explain the same, in such places as the Bishop's licence shall define.

Form of License.

A. B., by Divine permission, &c., to our well-beloved and approved in Christ, C. D., greeting.

We do by these presents grant to you our license to exercise the office of a Reader in the parish of F., within our diocese and jurisdiction, on the nomination of G. H., Rector of the said parish, and we do authorize you to read the Holy Scripture, &c., &c. [specifying what the Bishop pleases to authorize consistently with the Lambeth rules], to read the Lessons in the Parish Church, &c., to read such portions of the Morning and Evening Service in such and such a place, as the Bishop shall direct, &c.

And we do hereby notify and declare that this our license shall remain valid, and shall have full force and authority until either it shall be revoked by us or our successors, or a fresh institution to the Benefice shall have been made and completed, provided always that it shall be competent for an application to be made to us and our successors for a renewal and continuance of this our present license.

And so we commend you to Almighty God, humbly praying in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that His blessing may rest on you and your work.

Given, &c.

SUGGESTED SERVICE FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF A LAY READER,

TO BE USED IN THE PRIVATE CHAPELS OF ARCHBISHOPS AND BISHOPS.

When the day fixed upon by the Bishop is come, the Minister of the Parish for which a Reader is to be appointed shall present unto the Bishop (sitting in his Chair near to the Holy Table) the person desiring so to be appointed (the same being decently habited), saying these words,

Right Reverend Father in God, I present unto you this person to be appointed to the office of Reader in the parish of *A*.

The Bishop.

Hath the person whom ye present unto us been examined and found meet, both for his knowledge of God's Holy Word and his godly life and conversation, to exercise the office of a Reader in the said parish?

The Minister shall answer :

He hath been examined, and hath been found so to be.

Then the Bishop shall say unto those present :

Dearly beloved, forasmuch as this person, now presented unto us, hath been nominated and presented unto us by the *Rector* of the parish of *A*, and hath been found, after due examination, apt and meet to perform the duties of a reader, We, as Bishop and Minister of the Church of Christ, are ready and willing to appoint him to execute the duties of the said office within the parish of *A*, subject to such rules as we in our License shall set forth and declare. In token whereof we now purpose, in the presence of you all, to deliver into his hands the Holy Bible, authorising him to read the same to such within the said parish as shall need and desire this his godly ministration. But, before we thus solemnly appoint him to this office, let us humbly call upon God in prayer in the name of His blessed Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ, beseeching Him to regard with His favour and blessing this our Service, and to replenish with His heavenly grace this person now to be appointed Reader, that he may faithfully and dutifully execute his office, and humbly minister to the salvation of souls, both in the parish of *A* and wheresoever else hereafter he may be authorized to serve.

Then the Bishop shall pray in this wise and say :

Almighty God, abundant in mercy and pity, who dost vouchsafe thy heavenly blessing unto all such as do read and love thy holy Word, look down, we beseech thee, on this thy servant, now about to receive

in his hands the Holy Scriptures, and to be authorized to read the same to Thy people in the parish of A. Vouchsafe unto him Thy heavenly Spirit; give him grace faithfully to fulfil the duties that shall be entrusted to him; make him modest and humble in his ministration; ready and willing to obey those who are set over him in the Lord, and ever zealous to frame and fashion his own life and the lives of his family according to the teaching of those Holy Scriptures whereof he is now to be appointed a Reader. Grant unto him an increasing knowledge and love of Thy blessed Word, and enable him so to bring that Word home to the hearts of those that hear, that he may minister to the salvation of souls, to the glory of Thy Name, and to the edification of Thy holy Church. Grant this, O Lord, for the sake of Thy dear Son our Saviour Jesus Christ. *Amen.*

When this prayer is done the Bishop shall deliver the Bible to the person to be appointed Reader, the receiver humbly kneeling upon his knees, and the Bishop saying,

Take thou authority to read the Word of God, and to perform such other duties in the parish of A as shall be set forth in the license of the Bishop, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. *Amen.*

Then shall the Bishop say,

The Lord be with you.

Answer—And with thy spirit.

And (all kneeling down) the Bishop shall add,

Let us pray.

Our Father which art in heaven, &c.

And these Collects :

Blessed Lord who hast caused all Holy Scriptures to be written, &c. [Collect for Second Sunday in Advent.]

God who didst teach the hearts of thy faithful people, &c. [Collect for Whit Sunday, omitting words "at this time."]

Almighty God, who hast built thy Church, &c. [Collect for St. Simon and St. Jude.]

Prevent us, O Lord, in all our doings, &c. [One of the Collects at end of Communion Service.]

The peace of God which passeth all understanding keep your hearts and minds in the knowledge and love of God, and of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, and the blessing of God Almighty, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, be amongst you, and remain with you always. *Amen.*

THE NORTH EASTERN RAILWAY AND THE YORK CHURCH CONGRESS.

York, 3rd. Sept., 1866.

SIR,—It may be convenient to submit to your Board in writing the substance of the remonstrance presented by our deputation on Friday.

The object was not to ask the North Eastern to depart from the regulations adopted in common with other companies, but to be the medium of procuring a more intelligible and equitable rule than appears to have been yet laid down. Neither do we seek a peculiar privilege for this Congress, but only the same facilities which are granted to other assemblies of equal numbers and corresponding duration.

Return tickets were issued (and so far as we know without objection) for the Church Congresses which met at Cambridge in 1861, at Oxford in 1862, at Manchester in 1863, and at Bristol in 1864. Soon after the Bristol meeting the railway managers adopted a minute, which was read to the deputation at your Board, by which these facilities were to be withheld in future from meetings of a *clerical or religious* character.

In consequence (apparently) of this regulation, objection was made to the issue of similar tickets for the Norwich Church Congress in October, 1865, though these assemblies are not in strictness included in the terms of the minute. The objection, however, was surmounted by the representations of the Norwich committee, and the tickets were issued as before.

The Board informed our deputation that on the occasion of the recent Wesleyan Conference at Leeds, some companies granted tickets, and other (including your own) refused them;—a difference of practice which naturally gave rise to complaint.

On my application on behalf of the York Church Congress, it was very properly determined to avoid such a difference in future, and a further minute was read to the deputation, in which the managers unanimously agreed to uniformity in practice with regard to all future social, scientific, and religious concourses. In the propriety of that resolution our deputation cordially concurred.

But the resolution adopted on that unanimous agreement was simply to refuse the application of the York Church Congress, while it appears that return tickets have been subsequently issued, as before, to the British Association at their late meeting at Nottingham, and to the Agricultural Show at York.

Hence it would appear that the uniform practice now contemplated is that suggested in the minute of 1864; viz., to grant facilities to social and scientific meetings, and to refuse them to religious ones; the Church Congress being classed (as we think incorrectly) under the latter designation.

Against this distinction our deputation most earnestly, though respectfully, remonstrated. Without dwelling on the objection that the Church Congress is not properly speaking a clerical or purely religious meeting, but a mixed assembly of clergymen and laymen to discuss some of the most important social questions of the day, the Archbishop urged that it is beyond the province of a Railway Company to enter at all on the question of the purpose which their passengers have in view. Their decision should be governed by the number of travellers and the means of conveying them. His Grace expressly included Wesleyans, and all other religious bodies, in this argument, being convinced that no member of your Board would admit for a moment that social and scientific assemblies were to be favoured, and only religious ones discouraged. Such a distinction would never satisfy the public mind of this country.

On this simple ground the deputation submitted that our Congress ought to enjoy the same advantage with the British Association.

In answer to the objection that the desired facilities had been refused to the Wesleyan Conference at Leeds, the Lord Mayor, without justifying the refusal, remarked that the interference with the ordinary traffic was far less in the case of a Church Congress, which sits for three days only, than with a Conference lasting three weeks.

The Archbishop added that the concession applied for was not given in excess of the ordinary return ticket, but that, besides the principle involved, the Congress would

be seriously affected by its refusal, since many of the clergy are not in circumstances to afford the additional outlay. In fact letters have been already received intimating the inability of the writers to attend unless the return ticket is granted.

I enclose a scheme of the intended meeting, and beg leave to state that these Congresses have been usually attended by above 2000 members, of whom a very large proportion arrive by rail. At Norwich last year, and I believe in all former years, the companies issued return tickets at a single fare on production of the Congress ticket, the price of which is five shillings. I am to add that the Caledonian, the Glasgow and South Western, the Bristol and Exeter, with the London, Chatham, and Dover Companies, have signified their assent to our application for the same assistance. The Midland and the Lancashire and Yorkshire have expressed to us their regret that they are precluded by the general resolution referred to, and I have a communication from a director of the Great Northern, expressing their disposition to follow the action of the North Eastern.

I am, sir, your faithful servant,

GEO. TREVOR,

Hon. Sec.

To the Secretary N. E. Railway.

York, Sept., 7.

DEAR SIR,—I enclose a copy of a letter received from your chairman since the interview of our deputation with the Board. We should be entirely satisfied with the course laid down by Mr. Thompson, by which our Congress would receive the same facilities as were extended to the British Association.

Faithfully yours,

J. Cleghorn, Esq.,

G. TREVOR.

Auchnessee Lodge, Dunkeld, Perthshire, Sept. 1.

MY DEAR SIR,—I brought your letter forward at our last Board at York, and if you have been informed that any *religious* objection has been, or is likely to be, raised by the North Eastern directors or managers to the issuing of cheap tickets for those who propose to attend the Church Congress at York, your informant is entirely in error. The same facilities will be given that have been granted under like circumstances (as to time and numbers) to other bodies, whether *religious*, *scientific*, or *commercial*, who hold meetings in our district; more than this, I am sure, you would not think it reasonable to expect.

I am, dear sir, yours faithfully,

Rev. Canon Trevor.

H. S. THOMPSON.

The North Eastern Railway, Secretary's Office, York, 8th Sept., 1866.

SIR,—The Board, at their meeting yesterday, again considered the application made to them that return tickets should be issued to parties attending the Church Congress, to be held in York next month, on payment of a single fare. I was desired to inform you that the Board felt they could not deviate from the decision on the subject, which was unanimously come to at a recent meeting of representatives from all the leading railway companies in the kingdom, and which was communicated to the deputation who waited on the Board on the 31st ultimo.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

J. CLEGHORN, Secretary.

The Rev. Canon Trevor, York.

PROPOSAL FOR PRINTING FUTURE CONGRESS REPORTS,

FROM RIGHT HONBLE. EARL NELSON.

Trafalgar, Oct. 20th, 1866.

My dear Mr. Dean,

I am tempted to trouble you with a proposal of mine about the publication of the Congress papers.

The present system appears to me most unsatisfactory.

A paper read is given by the newspapers in a garbled form, and this is the only way in which it can reach the public at a time when they are likely to be interested by it.

When the Report comes out some two months hence, it will take its place in the Library, beside the Annual Register. In self defence we are driven to send our papers previously to some newspaper. The Archbishop, Myself, Lord Devon, Sir Roundell Palmer, Archdeacon Denison, *et al*: did so, but even this does not meet the want, while it may damage the sale of the Report.

To remedy all this and to put money into the publisher's hands.—I would propose.

1. That every reader of a paper should be requested to send the paper to a Printer a month before the day.
2. Printer to keep it private, send it for correction and furnish the writer with a printed copy for him (or in his absence for others) to read from at the Congress.
3. Copies of the papers read to be ready for sale at the next sitting of Congress, at 2d., or 4d., or 6d.
4. The rest of the discussion to be added to each paper, afterwards as an appendix. And all the papers as so many parts with such appendix to form the one volume of Congress Report afterwards. Those who bought it in parts to have covers delivered them if they prefer it to bind the parts up.

The advantages would be great, very few now order a three shilling Report, all would on an average buy at least three shillings worth of the parts.

1. The writer of the paper would take many copies to send about to ventilate the subject.

2. Those who had heard it read, to send to their friends, and to ventilate it also.

3. Those who had been absent at other sections would buy the authorised Reports of what they had not been able to hear.

The thing would pay and what is more to the purpose, each subject would be thoroughly ventilated: (*cg*) I would willingly take 100 copies of my paper to urge the matter forward.

Would you kindly lay this before the General Congress Committee, and propose it for the consideration of our Wolverhampton friends. Nothing could have gone off better than our Congress at York, and we all know how much of its success was owing to your kind sympathy and support.

Yours very truly,

NELSON.

To the Honble. and Very Rev. the Dean of York.

REGISTER

OF THE

Members of the York Church Congress.

- ADELAIDE, Lord Bishop of
 ANTIGUA, Lord Bishop of
 Abbey, Rev. Wm., Salton, Oswaldkirk
 Ackland, Rev. Thomas, Pollington Par-
 sonage, Selby
 Adams, Rev. C., Cainham, Shropshire
 Adam, Rev. G. R., Kilburn, London
 Adamson, Rev. W., Winsters, Windermere
 Ady, Archdeacon, Little Beddon, Chelms-
 ford
 Agar, Miss T.
 Ainslie, Rev. H. Easingwold, Yorks.
 Ainslie, Mrs., Easingwold
 Ainger, Rev. Dr., St. Bees College, Cam-
 bridge
 Aitkin, Rev. James, Womersley
 Akroyd, Col., M.P., Bankside, Halifax
 Akroyd, Mrs., ditto
 Allen, Rev., Altringham
 Allen, Rev. George S., Lower Broughton,
 Manchester
 Allen, Rev. Edmund E., Porthkerry,
 Glamorganshire
 Anderson, Rev. W. P., Winsford, Dul-
 verton
 Anderson, Sir Charles, Bart., Lea, Gains-
 borough
 Anderson, Miss
 Anderson, Rev. M. J., Hockering Rectory
 Anderson, Rev. R. S., Hounslow, Middle-
 sex
 Anson, Rev. G. H. G., Birch Rectory,
 Manchester
 Aplin, Miss
 Armistead, Rev. W., Garstang, Lancashire
 Armitage, Geo., Esq., Milnsbridge, Hud-
 dersfield
 Armitage, Rev. T. A., Whitwood, Nor-
 manton, Yorkshire
 Arnold, Frederick, Torquay
 Arnold, Miss, Ambleside
 Arundell, Rev. T. A., Vicar of Hayton,
 York
 Asaph St., Dean of
 Atlay, Rev. Canon, D.D., Vicarage, Leeds
 Atlay, Mrs., ditto
 Atkinson, Rev. F., Long Eaton, near
 Nottingham
 Atkinson, Rev. B., Harewood
 Atkinson, Mrs., North Carolina
 Atkinson, M. Esq., York
 Atkinson, Rev. M. A., Fakenham Rectory,
 Norfolk
 Atkinson, Mrs.
 Atkinson, Miss
 Atkinson, Miss S. J.
 Atkinson, J. B., Esq., York
 Atkinson, W., Esq., York
 Atwood, Rev. Allan Thos., Vicar of Leake,
 Thirsk
 Ayre, John Esq., Phoenix Foundry, York
 Ayrton, W. S., Esq., The Mount, York
 Ayrton, Miss
 BARBADOS, Lord Bishop of, Durham
 BRISBANE, Lord Bishop of
 Bacon, Miss, Pennsylvania
 Baillie, Hon. and Rev. Canon, Elsedon,
 Northumberland
 Bailey, Rev. Chas., Marton, Middlesboro'.
 Bailey, Rev. J. Grosmont, Whitby
 Bainbridge, T. Esq.
 Bagnall, T., Esq., Airy Hill House,
 Whitby
 Baker, Rev. J. B.
 Bandinel, Rev. James, Emley, Hudders-
 field, Yorkshire
 Bangham, Rev. T. A., Lichfield
 Banks, Rev. R., St. Catharine's, Doncaster
 Barclay, Rev. J., Runcorn
 Barclay, Rev. W., Bristol Church Union
 Bardsley, Rev. J., London
 Barker, T. Esq., Whitby
 Barker, Roger, Esq., Dunnington
 Barnes, Rev. H. F., Bridlington
 Barnett, Mr. T. M.
 Barnett, Mrs. T. M.
 Barnby, W., Esq., York
 Baron, Rev. John, Upper Scudamore,
 Warminster, Bucks.
 Barry, R., Esq., York
 Barstow, Thos., Esq., Garrow Hill, York
 Barstow, Mrs. ditto
 Barstow, Miss ditto
 Barstow, Miss A. ditto
 Barstow, Miss E. ditto
 Barstow, Miss M. ditto
 Barstow, Miss J. ditto

- Bartlett, Rev. F. A., York
 Bartlett, Rev. T., Milbrook, near Devonport
 Bartlett, Rev. Y. S., St. Leonards-on-the-Sea
 Barton, Rev. Canon, Wicken, near Stoney Stratford
 Barton, J. Hope, Esq., Stapylton Park, Pontefract
 Barton, Miss
 Bateman, Rev. John Fitzherbert, South Lopham Rectory, Norfolk
 Bates, Miss, Clayton, near Accrington
 Bathurst, Rev. Frederick, Diddington, Hunts.
 Battersby, Rev. Canon, Keswick
 Bayly, Rev. Thos. Clifton, York
 Baynes, Rev. W. H., S. Michael's, Coventry
 Bealey, Rev. J. K., Middlesboro'
 Beamish, Rev. Thos., Harome Parsonage, York
 Beamont, Rev. W., Trinity College, Cambridge
 Beatson, Miss, York
 Beattie, Mr. G., York
 Beauchamp, The Lord
 Beaufort, Rev. D. A., Warburton
 Beaumont, H. F., Esq., Boothly Hall, Grantham
 Beaumont, Mrs.
 Beckett, Rev. W., Heighington, Durham
 Beckett, Mrs., Heighlington
 Beckwith, Rev. H. W., Bishophill, York
 Beckwith, Mrs., York
 Bedford, Rev. F., Scarborough
 Bell, Rev. C. D., Ambleside
 Bell, W. E., Esq.
 Bell, Rev. D., Goole
 Bellamy, Rev. A., Huddersfield, Yorks.
 Bellamy, Rev. A., Chichester
 Belcher, T. W., Esq., Whitby
 Belcher, Rev. B., St. Gabriels, Pimlico, London
 Bellerby, Mr. T.
 Bene, Miss
 Bennett, J. M., Esq., Ardwick, Manchester
 Bennett, Mrs. J. M., ditto
 Bennett, Rev. F., Shrewton, Devizes
 Benwell, Rev. H., Bassingham
 Beresford, Rev. J., Bedale
 Bickerssteth, Archdeacon, D.D., Aylesbury
 Bigge, Rev. John F., Stamfordham Vicarage, Newcastle
 Billing, Rev. R. C., Louth
 Birch, Rev. J., West Teignmouth, Devon
 Birchall, Mr. J. D., Esq.
 Bird, Rev. Frederick
 Bird, Mrs.
 Birley, Rev. J. Shepherd, Moss Lee, Bolton-le-Moors
 Birley, Rev. J. Gibson, Birmingham
 Birley, Rev. R., Hulme, Manchester
 Birley, G.
 Birtwhistle, Rev. J. B., Beverley
 Bissett, Rev. T. H., D.D., Pontefract
 Black, Rev. T. F., Ballyeaston College, Antrim
 Blake, Rev. J. F., S. Peter's, College, York
 Blamire, Miss
 Blamire, Miss S.
 Bland, Rev. E. D., Kippax
 Blane, Rev. H., Folkton, Scarborough
 Bleaymare, Miss
 Blomefield, Rev. Sir Thomas E. W., Bart., Pontefract
 Blunt, Rev. R. F. L., Scarborough
 Blyth, Rev. E. K., Deepdale Parsonage, Lynn, Norfolk
 Boddy, Miss
 Bolckow, H. Esq., Marston Hall, Middlesborough.
 Bone, Rev. J., North Meols, Lancashire
 Booker, Rev. C. F., Stanningley Parsonage, Leeds
 Boothby, Capt.
 Boothby, Mrs.
 Borough, Rev. John, Derby
 Boulby, Rev. A., Aislaby, near Whitby
 Bower, R., Esq., Heworth, York
 Bower, Mrs.
 Bower, H. Esq., Welham, Malton
 Bowes, Miss
 Bowlby, Rev. Oldbury, Birmingham
 Bowlby, Mrs., ditto
 Bowness, Miss
 Boyd, Rev. Canon, Arncliffe, Skipton
 Boydell, Rev. E. N. V., Wingate Grange, Durham
 Boyes, Mr.
 Boynton, Sir Henry, Bart., Burton Agnes
 Brady, A., Esq., Maryland Point, Stratford
 Bradley, Rev. R., Haxby, near York
 Bradley, Mrs.
 Braithwaite, A. Esq., Bootham, York
 Braithwaite, Rev. W. Alne, Easingwold
 Braithwaite, Mrs.
 Braithwaite, Miss
 Branchard, Miss
 Brander, Rev. B., Beverley
 Breshner, Rev. M. R., York
 Brett, Robert, Esq., Stoke Newington
 Brewin, Rev. Geo., Wortley, Sheffield
 Brittain, Rev. J., Wressle
 Britton, Miss, Heyworth Hall
 Brock, Rev. H. F., Doncaster
 Bromehead, Miss
 Brook, Rev. Alfred, Mansfield Woodhouse, Notts.
 Brooks, Rev. E. B., New England, Parsonage, Peterboro'
 Brooks, Rev. Harvey, S. Stephen's, Paddington
 Brown, James, Esq., M.P., Copgrove Borobridge
 Brown, George, Esq., York
 Brown, Miss

- Brown, Rev. A., Calverley
 Brown, Mrs. ditto
 Browne, Rev. T. B., East Acklam
 Bruce, Rev. Canon, Merrington, Durham
 Bruce, Rev. Theophilus Robert, Carlton,
 Yeadon, Leeds
 Brunnen, Miss
 Brunskill, Rev. Jos.
 Brutton, Rev. T., Newcastle-on-Tyne
 Bryan, Rev. W. Butler
 Buckley, Rev. F. J., New Hall, Salisbury
 Buckwell, Rev. W. B., Littleover, Derby
 Buller, Rev. W. E., Over Stowey Vicar-
 age, Bridgwater
 Buller, Rev. W. E., Castle Howard
 Bullivant, Rev. H., Lower Whitley, Dewa-
 bury, Yorks.
 Bullock, Rev. W. T., Faulkbourne, Witham
 Bullock, Rev. R., Worcester
 Bulmer, Miss
 Bull, Rev. H., Newport Pagnell
 Buncombe, Rev. C. T., York
 Burfield, Rev. Canon, St. James's, Brad-
 ford
 Burt, Miss
 Burton, Mrs.
 Burton, Miss
 Burton, Rev. A., London
 Burton, A. H., Esq., ditto
 Butler, Rev. W. J., Thwing, Bridlington
 Butler, Rev. Johnson S., Penrith

 CANTERBURY, Lord Archbishop of,
 Addington, Surrey
 CHESTER, Lord Bishop of, Hawarden
 Castle, Chester
 Cadman, Rev. W., Holy Trinity, Mary-le-
 bone, London
 Calvert, Rev. Thos., Newcastle-upon-
 Tyne
 Camidge, Miss, York
 Campbell, Rev. Thomas, Brandsby, York
 Campbell, Rev. A. R., Aston, near Rother-
 ham, Yorkshire
 Campbell, Mrs., ditto
 Canon Miss
 Capetown, Dean of
 Cardale, Rev. E. T., Uckfield, Sussex
 Cardale, Mrs
 Carey, Rev. George, Lowthorpe
 Carlisle, Dean of, Deanery, Carlisle
 Carr, Rev. Henry B., Rector of Whick-
 ham
 Carr, Rev. Canon, Sherburn Hospital,
 Durham
 Carrol, Mrs., York
 Carter, Rev. W., Slingsby
 Carter, Rev. John., S. Michael's, York
 Carter, Rev. Thomas, Littleboro'
 Carter, Rev. W., Slingsby, Yorkshire
 Carter, Mrs
 Carter, Miss
 Cartledge, Rev. W. A., York
 Cation, Mrs

 Cator, Rev. C. Stokesley
 Cattley, Rev. H. T., Fulford
 Cattley, Miss, York
 Cattley, Rev. R., Worcester
 Cavendish, Lord Frederick, M.P
 Chadwick, Jas., Esq., York
 Chadwick, Rev. R., Rodwell, Yorkshire
 Chadwick, George, M., Esq., Littleboro'
 Chambers, Rev. O. L., Hook Hall, near
 Howden
 Champney, H. N., Esq., York
 Champney, J. E., Esq., York
 Champney, Mrs., York
 Champneys, Rev. Phipps, Badsworth
 Cheap, Mrs., Scarborough
 Cheap, Miss
 Cheese, Rev. J. A., Gosforth, Whitehaven,
 Cumberland
 Cheese, Mrs., ditto
 Cheetham, The Rev. Henry, Quarndon,
 Derby
 Chichester, Dean of, the Deanery, Chi-
 chester
 Cholmley, Miss, Fulford House
 Churton, Archdeacon, Craike, Easingwold
 Churton, Mrs
 Churton, Rev. H. B. W., Icklesham,
 Sussex
 Churton, Mrs
 Churton, Rev. W. R., King's College,
 Cambridge
 Clabon, J. M., Esq., Great George
 Street, Westminster
 Claridge Miss, York
 Clark, R. A., Esq., York
 Clark, Miss
 Clark, W., Esq., York
 Clarke, Rev. T., Erskine, Derby
 Clarke, T., Esq., Heworth, York
 Clayforth, Rev. Henry, Darfield, York-
 shire
 Clayton, Miss, York
 Clifford, Mr
 Clifford, Mr. J
 Close, Mr. Alderman, York
 Close, Rev. Robert Shaw, Kirkby Raven-
 worth, Richmond
 Clutton, W. T., Esq., York
 Coates, Rev. Canon, Sowerby, Thirsk
 Cobb, W. H., Esq., York
 Cockrill, Jno. Edwd., of North Eastern
 Hotel, Manchester
 Codrington, Rev. R. H., Long Sutton,
 Lincolnshire
 Cole, Rev. W. S., Ryther, Tadcaster
 Cole, Rev. E., Doddington Rectory, Lin-
 colnshire
 Colles, G. R. P., Esq.
 Collett, Rev. W. L., St. Stephen's,
 Hammersmith
 Colling, Miss
 Collins, T. Esq., Knaresborough
 Collins, Rev. W., St. Mary's, Ramsay,
 Huntingdon

- Collins, Rev. Thos., Knaresborough
 Collins, Rev. R., Kirkburton
 Collins, Rev. J., Knaresboro'
 Collvns, Rev. John Martyn, Benson
 Vicarage, Wallingford
 Coltman, W. J., Esq., Nabuin, York
 Compton, John, Esq.
 Cooke, Miss, Green Hammerton
 Cooper, Rev. A., Sigglesborne, Hull,
 Yorkshire
 Cooper, W., Esq., 37, North Marine
 Road, Scarboro'
 Cooper, Archdeacon, Kendal, West-
 moreland
 Cooper, G. L., Esq., York
 Cooper, Rev. H., Nunnington, Yorkshire
 Copland, Rev. G., York
 Cope, S. W. Esq.
 Copeland, Rev. W. J., Farnham
 Corbett, Rev. T. W., Wiggington
 Cordeaux, Rev. J., Hoyland
 Cordeaux, Mrs
 Cork, Dean of, Deanery, Cork, Ireland
 Cotter, Rev. W
 Cotter, Rev. W., St. Luke's, Belfast
 Court, Miss., Woodhouse, Huddersfield
 Courtenay, The Lady Agnes
 Cowan, Rev. Jas. Galloway, St. John's,
 Hammersmith
 Cowburn, Rev. R., Barrowford, Bromley
 Cowell, E. B., Esq
 Cowling, Miss, ditto
 Crabtree, Rev. E. W., St. Catharine's
 College, Cambridge
 Crabtree, Miss
 Crabtree, Miss, E. W
 Craufurd, Miss, York
 Craufurd, Miss, F., York
 Crawley, E. J., Esq.
 Crawshall, Rev. S. T., St. Mary's, Brompton,
 Middlesex
 Crewdson, Rev. G., Mile End, Stepney,
 Middlesex
 Creyke, Archdeacon, Bolton Percy, York
 Crickmer, Rev. C., Beverley, Yorkshire
 Croft, Rev. Canon, Hutton Bushell,
 Pickering
 Croft, Mrs. J
 Croft, Miss
 Cromhelm, Miss
 Cross, Rev. Dr., J. Chaplain to the
 Bishop of Tennessee
 Cross, R. A., Esq., Warrington
 Crosthwaite, Rev. B., Leeds
 Crosthwaite, Rev. R. J., Bishopthorpe
 Crowder, Miss
 Cruddas, Rev. G., Wawne
 Cumberland, Mr., York
 Curtler, Rev. T., Barbourne, Worchester
 Cutler, Rev. C. S., Hathersage, Derby-
 shire
 DOWN, CONNOR, AND DROMORE, The Lord
 Bishop of, Holywood, Belfast
 DUNEDIN, Lord Bishop of
 Dakers, The Rev. J. H. Hawick, Par-
 sonage, N.B.
 Danby, Rev. S., Weston by Welland,
 Morthants
 Daniel, Rev. W. C., Dewsbury
 Daniel, Rev. R., York
 Daniel, Mrs., York
 Darley, Mrs., York
 Darley, Miss
 Darley, Miss May
 Darwin, Fras., Esq
 Darnborough, Rev. J. W., South Otter-
 ington, Yorkshire
 Darnell, Mrs., Dringhouses, York
 Darnell, Miss
 Davie, Rev. T. G., Market Bosworth,
 Leicester
 Davie, Miss, T. G., ditto
 Davies, R. Esq., York
 Davies, Miss
 Davison, Rev. J., Hambleton, Rutland
 Davy, Rev. T. G
 Davy, Miss, T. G
 Dawnay, Hon. Payan, Benningborough,
 York
 Dawson, Rev. Arthur, 21, Dawson Street,
 Dublin
 Day, Rev. Bloxsome, Thirsk
 Dean, Rev. E., Barlby, near Selby
 Deck, Rev. J., Hull
 Deedes, Rev. Gordon, Heydour, Lin-
 colnshire
 Denison, Archdeacon, East Brent,
 Somerset
 Dent, Rev. F. R., St. Jude's, Leeds
 Dent, Joseph, Esq., Ribston Hall,
 Dent, Rev. J. J. D., Hunsingore
 Denton, Rev. C. T., Askham Richard,
 York
 Derby, Rev. C., Corbett
 Devon, Earl of, 23, Brook Street, Lon-
 don, W
 Dibb, John Edward, Esq., Wakefield
 Dibb, Miss
 Dick, Miss
 Dickson, Rev. J. B., Scotland
 Dicksons Mr., J
 Dingle, Rev. J., Whitby
 Dixon, Rev. Canon, Helmsley
 Dixon, Rev. E. S., Keswick Rectory,
 Norfolk
 Dixon, Miss, The Mount, York
 Dixon, Mrs., Minster Court
 Dobson, Mrs. C. H
 Dodgson, Archdeacon, Croft Rectory,
 Darlington
 Dodsworth, Geo., Esq., Clifton, York
 Dodsworth, Benj., Esq., Burton Lane, ditto
 Dodsworth, Mrs., Clifton
 Dombree, Rev. Leo
 D'Orsey, Rev. J.
 D'Orsey, Mrs.
 Douglas, Rev. W. F., Scrayingham, Yorks.

- Douglas, Hon. Rev. H., Hanbury Rectory,
 Brooms Grove
 Douglas, Rev. B. J., Pennsylvania
 Down, Dean of, Down Patrick, Ireland
 Dowry, Miss, M
 Doyle, Rev. William Whalley Range,
 Manchester
 Dromore, Dean, of
 Dugdale, Miss, Manchester
 Dugdale, Miss, E., ditto
 Duncombe, The Lady Harriet, Deanery,
 York
 Duncombe, Miss
 Duncombe, Miss C.
 Duncombe, Miss F.
 Duncombe, C., Esq.
 Duncombe, Hon. Admiral, M.P., Kiln-
 wick Park, Pocklington
 Duncombe, The Rev. Edward, Barthom-
 ley, Crewe
 Dundas, Mrs
 Dunhill, Dr., York
 Dunn, Rev. T., Hulme, Manchester
 Durnford, Rev. Canon, Middleton, Man-
 chester
 Dury, Rev. E., Bishop Thornton,
 Ripley
 Duval, Rev. P. S., 7, Panton Square,
 Haymarket, W
 Dwaris, Rev. B. E., Bywell Vicarage,
 Northumberland
 Dyson, Mr., Clifton
 Dykes, Rev. Dr.

 Eade, Rev. John, D., Vicar of Aycliffe,
 Durham
 Eaden, Rev. J., Dringhouses, York
 Easterby, Rev. R. D., Lastingham
 Easterby, Mrs., ditto
 Eddowes, Rev. John, S. John's, Bradford
 Eden, Rev. C. P., Aberford, Yorkshire
 Edwards, Rev. Arthur W., Finlagan
 Rectory, Derry
 Edwards, Rev. William M., Clonleigh,
 Lifford, Derry
 Edwards, Miss, Lastingham, Yorkshire
 Edwards, Rev. J., Newtown, Montgomery
 Edwards, Sir Henry, Bart., M.P., Pie
 Nest, Halifax
 Edwards, Miss, Old Wellhead, Halifax
 Egerton, Mrs
 Eglington, Miss
 Eldridge, Rev. T. A., Bishop Wilton, near
 Pocklington
 Ellam, Rev. J. E., Drypool, Hull
 Ellerton, Rev. J., Crewe Green Parson-
 age, Crewe
 Ellis, Rev. J. F., Pocklington, Yorkshire
 Elmhirst, Rev. W. Stainborough, Barnsley,
 Yorkshire
 Elwyn, Rev. W. M. H., Waresley, S. Neots
 Elwyn, Rev. Richard, Head Master of
 S. Peter's School, York
 Elwyn, Mrs., York

 Ely, Dean of, The Deanery, Ely
 Ely, Rev. John, Mayes Street, Manchester
 Emery, Archdeacon, Ely
 Emly, Dean of, Strabane, Ireland
 Empson, Rev. A. J., Eydon Rectory,
 Banbury
 Empson, J. W. Esq.
 English, Rev. Charles, Parsonage, Syden-
 ham
 English, Rev. Dr., Brentwood, Essex
 Errington, Rev. J. R., Vicar of Ashburne
 Espin, Rev. T. S., Hadleigh, Essex
 Evans, Rev. John, Grassendale, Liverpool
 Evans, Rev. Thos. Simpson, Shoreditch,
 London
 Evans, Rev. W. S., York
 Everton, Rev. S
 Evers, Rev. E., York
 Evers, Mr. Alderman, York
 Ewen, Rev. Edward, Colchester
 Eyre, Miss, Thorp Arch, Tadcaster

 Falkner, Rev. T., York
 Falkner, Mrs. ditto
 Farrow, Rev. J., Upper Helmsley
 Faussett, Rev. A. R., Heworth, York
 Fawcett, William, Esq., York
 Fawcett, Mrs., South Parade, York
 Fenwick, Robt., Esq., Fulford
 Fenwick, Mrs.
 Festing, Rev. G. A.
 Feversham, The Lord, Duncombe Park,
 Helmsley
 Ffoulkes, Archdeacon, Llandyssil, Mont-
 gomery
 Field, Rev. J., West Rounton, Yorkshire
 Fish, Rev. I., Castle Howard
 Fish, Mrs. ditto
 Fish, Rev. R. G., Stillington
 Fisher, Rev. Fredk.
 Fisher, Rev. R.
 Fisher, Rev. J.
 Fisher, Mrs.
 Fitch, J. G., Esq., Heworth, York
 Fitch, Mrs. ditto
 Fitzroy, E. A., Esq.
 Flaxton, Mrs.
 Fleming, Rev. J. R.
 Flowers, Rev. O. H., Sheriff Hutton
 Flowers, Mrs., Sheriff Hutton
 Floyd, Rev. C. G., Malpas, Cheshire
 Ford, Rev. C. H., Bishopton, Stockton-
 on-Tees
 Fosbery, Rev. T. V., S. Giles, Reading
 Foster, Jas. Lancelot, Esq., York
 Foster, Rev. F. A. L., Saxby, Lincolnshire
 Fourbe, Miss
 Fowler, Hodgson C., Esq.
 Fowler, Rev. Charles A., S. Margaret's,
 Canterbury
 Fox, S. W., Darrington, Esq.
 Fox, Rev. J. H., Padiham, Lancashire
 Fox, Rev. Edwin, S. John's, York
 Fox, G. Lane, Esq.

Fraser, Rev. W., D.C.L., Alton Vicarage,
Staffordshire
Fray, M. L., Esq.
Foxley, Rev. J., Market Weighton
Frost, Rev. A. H.

Gaisford, Rev. S. H., Clifford, Tadcaster
Galway, Viscountess
Garbett, Rev. E., Christ Church, Surbiton,
Kingston

Garbutt, Rev. G
Gardner, Rev. Dr., Skelton Rectory,
Redcar

Garfit, Rev. Arthur, Richmond, Surrey

Garfit, Mrs.

Gatty, Rev. Alfred, D.D., Ecclesfield
Vicarage, Sheffield

Geddes, Rev. J. G., Hamilton, Toronto
Gedge, Rev. J. H., St. Michael's, Chester
Square, London

Geldart, Rev. T. W., LL.D., Kirk
Deighton

George, Rev. P. E., Combe Hay, Bath
George, Mrs. ditto

Gholson, Mrs., Leamington

Gholson, Miss ditto

Gibbs, Rev. T. G., Doncaster

Gibbons, Rev. B. Mitton, Stourport, Wor-
cestershire

Gibson, W. Sidney, Esq., Tynemouth

Gifford, Rev. B. R., Illinois, United
States

Gill, Rev. W., 5, Hyde Road, Manchester

Gill, Rev. J., London

Gillitt, Rev. G. E., Ilfracombe

Glaister, Rev. W., Southwell, Notts.

Glaister, Miss ditto

Gleadowe, Rev. R. W., Neston, Cheshire

Glover, Rev. R. A., Brading, Isle of Wight

Glover, Rev. E

Godfray, Rev. F., D.C.L., S. Helier's,
Jersey

Godson, Rev. John, Triangle, nr. Halifax

Goe, Rev. F. F., Christ Church, Hull

Gooch, Mrs., Southcliffe, near Halifax

Gooch, Rev. Canon, Stainton, Yorkshire

Goodacre, Mrs. M.

Gordon, Rev. E., Kildale, Northallerton

Gott, Rev. John

Gough, Rev. Benjamin B., Maghera,
Diocese of Derry

Grant, Archdeacon, Aylesford Vicarage,
Maidstone

Granville, Rev. C., Alnwick

Graves, John, Esq., 2, Esplanade, Whitby

Graves, Rev. J., Rotherham, Yorks.

Gray, W., Esq., York

Gray, Mrs.

Gray, E., Esq., York

Grayston, J., Esq., York

Gray, Rev. C., East Retford

Green, Richard, Esq., York

Green, Rev. C., Bishop Auckland, Durham

Green, Rev. C. S., Helme

Greenhow, Rev. E., Newton-on-Ouse

Greenstreet, Rev. W. G., Pattingham

Greenwood, John, Esq., Swarcliffe Hall,
Ripley

Gregory, Rev. R., Lambeth, Surrey

Gregory, T., Esq., Brunswick Terrace,
Scarborough

Grey, Rev. W. H. C., Wilford, near
Nottingham

Grey, Hon. and Rev. J., Houghton-le-
Spring Rectory, Fence Houses

Grey, Hon. and Rev. Francis, Cliveden,
Maidenhead

Grey, The Lady Elizabeth ditto

Griffiths, Rev. J., Flaxton

Grindle, Rev. E. S., Sigglesthorne, Hull

Grindle, Rev. H. A. L., St. Peter's,
Devizes

Gruggen, Rev. F. J., Pocklington Gram-
mar School

Gruggen, Mrs. ditto

Gruggen, Rev. G. S., Newcastle-on-Tyne

Guest, Rev. G. W., York

Guest, Mrs. ditto

Guilding, Rev. J. M., Sowerby, Thirsk

Gutch, J. J., Esq., York

Gutton, Rev. C. S., Hatfield Peverell,
Chelmsford

Hailstone, Rev. J., Bottisham

Hailstone, Mrs.

Hailstone, Miss

Haily, Rev. R. W., Thorp Arch Grange

Hairby, Rev. J.

Hale, Archdeacon, Charterhouse

Hales, Rev. T. D., Richmond, Surrey

Hall, Rev. E., Myland Rectory, Colchester

Hall, Rev. J. S., Dalby Rectory, York

Hall, Miss

Hall, Rev. T. Hepworth, Purstone Hall,
Pontefract

Hall, J., Esq., Scarborough

Hall, Rev. Dr., St. Vigors, Cambridge-
shire

Hall, Miss, London

Hamilton, Mrs., 46, The Mount, York

Hamilton, Rev. R. H., Oulton, Yorkshire

Hamilton, Miss, Clarence Street, York

Hamilton, Archdeacon, Eglington Vicar-
age, Alnwick

Hannah, Rev. Dr., Trinity College, Glen-
almond, Perthshire

Hanson, Rev. John, Pitsmoor, Sheffield

Hansell, T. W., Esq.

Harcourt, Egerton, Esq., Whitwell Hall,
York

Hardacre, Mr., York

Hardacre, R., Esq.

Hardman, Rev. R. P., Armin, Yorkshire

Hardy, Right Hon. Gathorne, M.P.,
Grosvenor Crescent, London

Harewood, Misses

Hargrove, W. W., Esq., York

Hargrove, Alfred E., Esq., York

Hargrove, Mrs., York
 Harland, Rev. Edward, Colwich Vicarage,
 Stafford
 Harris, Rev. T. F. O., West Hartlepool
 Harris, Hon. Archdeacon, Bremhill
 Harris, T. J. H.
 Harris, Rev. T., Kirkheaton Hall, New-
 castle-on-Tyne
 Harrison, Rev. W. E., York
 Harrison, Mrs.
 Harrison, W. P., Esq., M.D., Ilkley
 Harrowby, Earl of, K.G., Sandon Hall,
 Stone, Staffordshire
 Hartley, Rev. T., Raskelf
 Harvey, Rev. H., Betley, Staffordshire
 Haslewood, Rev. Boulby, Training College
 Haslehurst, Rev. R. K., Alrewas Vicarage
 Hastings, Rev. Canon, Hartley Rectory
 Hatchard, Rev. T. G., S. Nicholas Rectory,
 Guildford
 Hatchard, Mrs. ditto
 Hatchard, Miss ditto
 Hawkins, Rev. Edward, Huddersfield
 Haworth, Rev. W., Chesterfield
 Haynes, Rev. E. C., Goole
 Headlam, Rev. A., Worlton, near Dar-
 lington
 Healey, Mrs.
 Heaps, Rev. T. W.
 Heaton, W. C., Esq.
 Heaton, Rev. C. W., Plumton Rectory,
 Northampton
 Heaton, Rev. H. E., Bettws-yn-Rhos,
 Denbighshire
 Hedley, Rev. Canon, Masham, Bedale
 Herman, Rev. J.
 Heron, Rev. G., Carrington, Cheshire
 Herringham, Rev. W. H.
 Heslop, Rev. E. W., Thornton Rectory,
 Pickering
 Hessey, Rev. J. A., D.C.L., Merchant
 Tailors' School, London
 Hessey, Rev. Fras. D.C.L., West Ken-
 sington, Middlesex
 Hewitt, Rev. W. H., Yarborough Rectory,
 Louth
 Hewson, Rev. W., Goatland, Pickering
 Hey, Rev. Canon, Residence York
 Hey, Miss Lucy, ditto
 Hey, Miss Annie, ditto
 Hick, Rev. J., Byers Green, Durham
 Hick, Mrs.
 Hiley, Rev. R. W., Thorp Arch Grange
 Hiley, Mrs.
 Higgins, Charles Longuet, Esq.
 Higgins, Mrs.,
 Hildyard, Rev. H. S., Lofthouse, near
 Redcar
 Hill, T., Esq., London
 Hill, Mrs., ditto
 Hillyard, Rev. E. A., Norwich
 Hinde, Rev. H., Pontefract
 Hitchcock, Rev. W. M., Whitburn Rectory,
 Sunderland

Hodges, Rev. G. S., Wingates, Bolton
 Hodges, Rev. J., Ilfley
 Hodgkinson, Rev. John, Strensall
 Hodgson, Rev. H. W., Ashwell, Herts
 Hodgson, Mr.
 Hodgson, Mrs.
 Hodgson, Rev. C., Barton-le-Street
 Hodgson, Mrs., Harrogate
 Holden, F. J., Esq., Hull
 Holgate, Wyndham, Esq., Church Insti-
 tution
 Holmes, Rev. G., Holme Vicarage, York
 Holroyd, Rev. J., Bardsey, Wetherby
 Holby, John, Esq.
 Hone, Rev. E. J., Wentworth Parsonage,
 Rotherham
 Hoole, Rev. W. S., Briercliffe, Burnley
 Hoole, Mrs., ditto
 Hope, Rev. C. A., Berwick-in-Elmet
 Hope, A. B. Beresford, Esq., M.P., Bed-
 gebury Park, Cranbrook
 Hope, Mrs. ditto
 Hope, Rev. T., Halifax, Yorkshire
 Hopkinson, Miss, York
 Hordern, Rev. J., Burton Agnes, Brid-
 lington
 Hornby, Rev. R. W. B., D.D., Clifton,
 York
 Horsfall, A., Esq., Whitkirk, near Leeds
 Hough, Rev. G., South Crossland, York-
 shire
 Houghton, The Lord, Frystone Hall
 Houlthouse, C. S., Esq.
 How, Rev. W. W., Whittington Rectory,
 Salop
 Howard, Hon. and Rev. Canon, Whiston
 Rectory, Rotherham
 Howard, Mr.
 Howell, Rev. Canon, Drayton Rectory,
 Norwich
 Howson, Rev. J. S., D.D., Wisbech
 Hoyland, Rev. T. Felkirk, Wakefield
 Hubbard, J. G., Esq., M.P., Addington
 Manor, Bucks
 Hubbersty, Rev. R. C., Cartmel, Lanca-
 shire
 Hubbersty, Mrs. ditto
 Hudson, H. Arthur, Esq., Bootham, York
 Hudson, Mrs. H. A. ditto
 Hudson, Mr. Holdgate
 Huff, Rev. E., Little Cawthorpe, Lincoln-
 shire
 Hulbert, Rev. Canon, Slaithwaite Par-
 sonage, Huddersfield
 Hulbert, Mrs. ditto
 Humphrey, Rev. W. T., East Stockwell,
 Gainsborough
 Hurst, Mrs., Mirfield
 Hustler, Rev. G., Stillingfleet, Yorkshire
 Husband, W. D., Esq., York
 Hutchinson, Rev. W., Howden
 Hutchinson, Mrs.
 Hydes, Rev. John

ILLINOIS, Lord Bishop of, Chicago, United States

Ibbetson, Mrs.

Ince, Rev. E. C., Meltham Mills, Huddersfield, Yorkshire

Inge, Rev. W. Crayke, Easingwold

Inge, J. L., Lichfield

Ingleby, Lady

Ingram, Meynell, Esq., Temple Newsam, Leeds

Ingram, Rev. R.

Irvin, Rev. J., Brotherton, Yorkshire

Irvin, Rev. T., Ormsby Vicarage

Irvin, Mrs.

Irvine, Rev. J. W., Chelmsford

Ivatt, Rev. W. A., Coveney, Cambridge-shire

Jackson, Rev. E., Leeds

Jackson, Rev. W. Ward, Middlesboro'

Jackson, Rev. Robt., Kilburn

Jackson, Rev. H. Marshall, Old Edgefield

Jackson, Miss, Fairburn

Jackson, Rev. T., Little Blackenham, Ipswich

James, Rev. John, Avington, Hungerford

James, Mrs.

James, Miss

James, Rev. Francis J., Stockton-on-Tees

James, Rev. Edward, Peakirk, Northants

Jarratt, Rev. Canon, North Cave

Jefferson, Rev. Canon, Thicket Priory

Jefferson, Miss, ditto

Jeffcock, John, Esq., Cowley Manor, near Sheffield

Jeffcock, Mrs.

Jeffcock, Rev. J. S., St. Saviour's, Hoxton

Jenner, Rev. Edmund

Jenner, Mrs.

Jenner, Miss

Jennings, Rev. H., Watton

Jennings, Mrs.

Jennings, Rev. W. H., Coneysthorpe, Malton

Jennings, Miss

Jessop, Mr., York

Johnson, H. B., Esq., York

Johnstone, Rev. Canon, Sutton Hall

Johnstone, Rev. C., Scarborough

Johnstone, Sir J. V. B., Bart., M.P., Hackness Hall, Scarborough

Johnstone, Rev. John, Haxey, Bawtry

Johnstone, Rev. Bolton, Farndon, Cheshire

Jones, Rev. Canon, Bishopthorpe, York

Jones, W., Esq., 20, King's Arms Yard, London, E.C.

Jones, A. G., Esq.

Jones, Rev. H., Thornes Parsonage, Wakefield

Jones, Miss

Jones, Mr. Fowler, York

Jones, Mrs. Fowler, ditto

Jourdain, Rev. Francis, Derwent, Derbyshire

Joyce, Rev. F. H., Harrow-on-the-Hill, Middlesex

Jubb, Rev. Henry, Dunham Vicarage, Newark

KILMORE, Lord Bishop of, Palace, Kilmore, Cavan

Kay, Rev. W., D.D., Lincoln College, Oxford

Kay, Mrs., The Mount, York

Kay, Miss ditto

Karney, Rev. Gilbert S., Carlisle

Kearsley, Mr. W., Little Stonegate, York

Kelke, Rev. A. Hastings, Leeds

Kelsey, J., Esq., East Mount Road, York

Kemble, Rev. Edward

Kemp, Rev. W. H., Hull

Kemplay, Rev. R., Kelfield

Kennion, the Rev. R. W., Norwich

Kenny, Rev. T. S., Kirby Knowle, Thirsk, Yorkshire

Kenworthy, Rev. J. W.

Kerr, Rev. St. George, Langrville Parsonage, near Boston

Kerry, Rev. Chas.

Kershaw, Rev. Henry, Greenhow Hill, Ripon

Keyworth, H., Esq., York

King, Rev. S., Doncaster

Kingsley, Rev. W., South Kilvington

Kinnear, Rev. H. G., Hull

Kipling, Mrs., York

Kirby, Miss, York

Kitchin, Rev. F., St. Peter's School, York

Kitching, Rev. R., Westow, near Malton

Kitching, Mrs.

Knox, Rev. E.

Krukenberg, Miss

Lace, Rev. J. W., Wells, Somerset

Lancashire, Geo., Esq.

Landon, Miss, Braunton, N. Devon

Landon, Rev. A., Margaret St., Cavendish Square, London

Landon, Rev. J. T. B., Ledsham, Yorks.

Lane, Rev. E. A., Marsk, near Redcar

Lane, Mrs.

Lane, Miss E.

Lane, Miss M. A.

Lascelles, Hon. and Rev. J. W., Goldborough, Yorks.

Lascelles, Hon. Mrs.

Lascelles, Miss

Law, Rev. Fred. Henry, Lullington Vicarage, Burton-on-Trent

Law, Lady Adelaide, ditto

Lawley, Hon. and Rev. S. W., Escrick

Lawrence, Rev. J., Springdale, Huddersfield

Lawson, Rev. H.

Lawson, Miss A.

Lawson, A. S., Esq., Aldbro' Manor

Lawton, Rev. M. A., Kilnwick Percy

Lawton, W. Esq., Nunthorpe, York

Lawton, Miss H.
 Lawton, Miss
 Lawton, Miss F. A.
 Laycock, Rev. W. B., Southowram, Halifax
 Laycock, Mrs., ditto
 Laycock, Wm. Hay, Esq., Leeds
 Leach, Rev. Henry, St. Luke's, Bradford
 Leaward, J. A., Esq., Ashgrove, Wavertree,
 Liverpool
 Lee, Rev. Dr., Ahoghill, Ballymena, Ireland
 Lee, Rev. F. G., D.C.L., 19, Coles Hill
 Street, London, S.W.
 Leeman, George, Esq., M.P., York
 Lees, G. W., Esq., Clifton
 Legard, Rev. F. D., Whitwell
 Legard, George, Esq., Easthorpe, Malton
 Legge, Rev. A. G., Camsey Ash, Suffolk
 Leighder, Rev. D. F.
 LeMaistre, Rev. James, L.L.D., Adling-
 fleet, Howden
 Lendrum, Rev. A., Mut Hill, Perthshire
 Lester, Rev. Dr., Lower Norwood, Surrey
 Leveson, Rev. W., Liverpool
 Lewis, Rev. W. S., Ripon
 Lewthwaithe, Rev. Geo., Adél, Leeds
 Lindsay, Hon. Col. Silwood, Brighton
 Lipscomb, Rev. Francis, Welbury
 Little, Colonel, York
 Littlewood, Rev. W. E., Hipperholme,
 Halifax
 Liversidge, W., Esq., junr.
 Lloyd, Rev. Y. G., Sewerby
 Lloyd, E. Esq., Lingeroft
 Lloyd, Miss
 Lloyd, Mrs., Nunthorpe
 Lock, Rev. W. E., Brandsby, York
 Locking, Rev. J. S.
 Lockley, Mr.
 Lockley, Dr., Bootham, York
 Long, Ven. Archdeacon, Settrington
 Long, Miss
 Longstaff, Dr., Pontefract
 Lord, James, Esq., Wandsworth Common,
 London
 Lother, Charles, Esq.,
 Lother, Mrs.
 Lother, Miss
 Lowe, Rev. W., Bunbury Vicarage,
 Tarporley
 Lowrie, Captain, York
 Lowrie, Miss, York
 Lowther, Sir John, Bart., Wilton Castle
 Lowther, James, Esq., M.P., Bawtry
 Loxham, Rev. T., Great Lever, Bolton,
 Lancashire
 Luard, Rev. A. C., Wadworth, Yorks
 Lyttelton, Hon. and Rev. W. H. Hagley,
 Worcester

Mackarness, Rev. J. F., Honiton
 Mackarness, Rev. Geo. Ilam, Vicarage,
 Ashburne
 Maclean, Rev. Migel, Polworth, Tamworth
 Mackenzie, Rev. H. M., Belle Vue,
 Whitehaven
 Mackenzie, M. Esq., Whitehaven
 Mackesy, Rev. W. P
 Mackesy, Mrs
 Magham, Rev. B. B., Gough
 Maister, Rev. Arthur, Kexby Parsonage,
 York
 Male, Dudley, Palgrave, Diss
 Mallinson, Mrs
 Manisty, Rev. James, Easington Rectory,
 Durham
 Manstead, J., Esq., Micklegate, York
 Manstead, Mrs
 Manstead, Miss L.
 Manstead, Miss H.
 Manwaring, Rev. C. W
 Mare, Rev. W. S., Bramham
 Mare, Mrs., ditto
 Margetts, Rev. F., Aldborough, near Hull
 Markham, Mrs., York
 Marriner, Rev. Canon, Clapham, Lanc.
 Marriott, Rev. R. W., Aldbro' Vicarage,
 Boroughbridge
 Marriott, Rev. C. P., Grammar School,
 Richmond, Yorkshire
 Marshall, Octavius, Esq
 Marshall, Rev. John, Greetland Parson-
 age, Halifax
 Marshall, Mr., East Cotton
 Marshall, Mr
 Mashwin, Rev. J., Tanfield
 Mason, T. R. H. Esq., 28, Old Bond
 Street, London
 Mason, Rev. J., Sherburn, nr. Malton
 Mason, Rev. C., Bilsby Lincolnshire
 Mason, Mrs. C., ditto
 Master, Archdeacon, Croston, near Preston,
 Lanc.
 Matterson, William, Esq., M.D., York
 Matterson, Miss
 Matterson, Miss, F
 Matterson, Miss, York
 Maude, Captain, Holgate Road, York
 Maude, Rev. J., York
 Maude, Miss, York
 Maxwell, Rev. Charleton, Leck Patrick,
 Derry
 May, Rev. F. S., Poddington, Middlesex
 Mayow, Rev. M. W., West Brompton
 Middlesex
 McCallan, Rev. F., Matthews Parsonage,
 Nottingham
 McCheane, Rev. Jas. H., Leeds
 McDonough, Rev. J., Friezland, Man-
 chester
 McDonald, Mrs.
 McDonald, Miss
 McDowell, Rev. T. R., Whitwood Mere,
 Yorkshire

MORAY AND ROSS, Lord Bishop of, Hedge-
 field House, Inverness
 Maber, Rev. C., Howsham, York
 Maber, Mrs., ditto
 Macdonogh, Rev. Telford, Roscrea, Ireland

McIlwain, Rev. W., St. George's, Belfast
 McLean, Rev. Donald S., Cannock Chase
 McLean, Rev. H.
 Meek, Mrs. (The Lady Mayoress), Middlethorpe Lodge, York
 Meek, Miss
 Meek, Miss, J. M.
 Mercer, Rev. T. W., Northallerton
 Merriman, The Rev. George, Sidmouth Street, Reading
 Metcalfe, Rev. B. E., White Cross Lodge, York
 Metcalfe, Rev. J. P., Bilbro'
 Meyrick, Rev. F., Norwich
 Mickle, Mrs
 Micklethwait, Rev. W., Chapeltown Parsonage, Sheffield
 Micklethwaite, Rev. R. G., Barnsley
 Middlemore, Mr. James, Griffins Hill, Birmingham
 Middlemore, Mrs
 Middleton, Rev. H. O., Denton, Otley
 Middleton, Rev. Wm. G., Brampton
 Middlewood, Mrs
 Middlewood, Miss
 Middlewood, Miss, E
 Midgley, Rev. T., Ickham, near Sandwich, Kent
 Milburn, Rev. W., Redcar, Yorkshire
 Mildmay, Rev. A., St. John, Marston, York
 Mildmay, Mrs., ditto
 Mills, Miss, Heworth Hall
 Mills, Miss, York
 Milman, Rev. J. W. M. Henley, Sykehouse Parsonage, Snaith
 Milner, Rev. W. H., Horncastle, Lincolnshire
 Milner, Mrs.
 Milner, Miss, F
 Milner, Miss, L
 Milnes, Miss, Manchester
 Mitchell, Rev. J. M., Alabama, U.S.
 Mitchell, Mrs. J. M., Alabama, U.S.
 Mitton, Rev. H. A., Heaton, Bradford
 Monk, Dr., York
 Monk, Mrs., ditto
 Monson, Rev. Thos., Kirby Underdale Rectory
 Monson, Hon. Mrs. ditto
 Mooney, Rev. W. J., Beverley
 Moore, Ven. Archdeacon, Kirk Andreas, Isle of Man
 Moore, Miss, Gillygate
 Moore, Mr. W., 3, S. Mary's
 Moore, Miss
 Moore, Mr
 Moore, Mrs
 Moore, Miss, M., York
 Moore, Miss A
 Moorsom, Colonel, 2, North Terrace, Whitby
 Morehead, Rev. G. J., Easington, Redcar
 Moreland, Mrs. Rice
 Morcland, Mrs

Morgan, Rev. A. A., S. John's, Brighton
 Morley, Rev. R., Rotherham
 Morley, Mrs
 Morley, Miss
 Morrell, Rev. G. K., Mouldsford, Vicarage, Wallingford
 Morrell, W., Wilberforce
 Morritt, W. J. S., Esq., Rokeby
 Morrison, Wilson, Esq.
 Morrison, Rev. W. R., St. James, Halifax
 Morris Rev. Thos., Eastham, Worcester
 Morton, Miss
 Mosley, Mr., York
 Moyle, Rev. V. H., North Ormesby
 Mozrat, Rev. A
 Munby, F. J., Esq., Manchester
 Munby, J. Forth, Esq., Clifton, York
 Munby, Mrs. J. F., York
 Munby, Miss
 Munn, Miss, Askham Hall
 Murray, Rev. F. H., Rectory, Chislehurst
 Musgrave, Ven. Archdeacon, Halifax
 Musgrave, Rev. Canon, Etton Rectory, Beverley
 Myers, Rev. T., York
 Mynell, Rev. H., Denstone Parsonage, Ashburne, Derby
 NEWFOUNDLAND, Lord Bishop of
 NELSON, Lord Bishop of
 NORTH CAROLINA, Lord Bishop of
 Nanney, Mrs., Chapter House Street, York
 Napier, Right Hon. J., 4, Merrion Square, Dublin
 Needham, Mrs., York
 Needham, Mrs. F., ditto
 Nelson, Earl, Trafalgar, Salisbury
 Netherwood, Rev. J., Appleby, Westmoreland
 Nevin, Rev. T. Mirfield, Yorkshire
 Neville, Rev. Charles, Fledborough Rectory, Newark
 Newenham, Rev. B. B., Bilton, York
 Newenham, Mrs.
 Newlove, Rev. Richard, Thorner Vicarage, near Leeds
 Newlove, Mrs.
 Newman, Mrs. W. L.
 Newman, Rev. F. S., Thorp Arch
 Newman, Rev. F. B., Burton Latimer, Wellington
 Newman, Rev. F. W., Low Street, Halifax
 Newman, Rev. J., Westborough, Barnsley
 Newton, Rev. W. S. Ousebridge, York
 Newton, Henry, Esq., York
 Newton, Miss, York
 Newton, Miss L. A., ditto
 Newton, Miss A. R., ditto
 Newton, Rev. D.
 Newton, Rev. H., Southwark, Surrey
 Noble, T. S., Esq., York
 Norcliffe, Major
 Norcliffe, Mrs., Langton Hall

Norcliffe, Miss C.
 Norcliffe, Miss B.
 Norcliffe, Miss J.
 Norman, Rev. Denham, Vicar of Middleton-
 by-Worksworth
 Norris, Rev. Chas., Woodhall, near Halifax
 North, S. W., Esq., York
 Noyes, Rev. J. H., Stamford

OXFORD, Lord Bishop of, Cuddesden Pal.
 O'Brien, W., Esq., York
 Oldfield, Joshua, Esq., York
 Oldfield, George, Esq., York
 Oldfield, Miss, York
 Oldham, Rev. Ralph, Myton Vicarage,
 Boroughbridge
 Ommanney, Rev. G. D. W., Whitchurch,
 Somerset
 Orlebar, Sacristan, Durham
 Ormesby, Rev. G., Fishlake, Doncaster
 Osborne, Rev. G. Y., Vicar of Fleetwood
 Otter, Rev. G., Hucknall
 Ould, Rev. F., Tatton Hall, Cheshire
 Overton, Rev. J., Sessay, Yorkshire
 Owen Sidney, Esq., Ch. Ch., Oxford
 Owen, Rev. R. D., Boroughbridge
 Owston, Mrs.

PENNSYLVANIA, Lord Bishop of
 Page, R. L., Redcar
 Paget, Rev. Canon, Welton; Yorks.
 Paget, Mrs.
 Paley, T. C., Esq., York
 Paley, Mrs. T. C.
 Paley, Rev. F. H., Penn, Wolverhampton
 Paley, Miss, Penn, Wolverhampton
 Paley, E. G., Esq., Lancaster
 Paley, Rev. John, Codsall, Staffordshire
 Paley, Miss, Oatlands, Harrogate
 Palmer, Rev. H. V., York
 Palmer, Mrs. ditto
 Palmer, Sir Roundell, M.P., Q.C., 11,
 New Square, Lincoln's Inn
 Palmer, Miss M., Doncaster
 Palmes, Rev. J., The Mount
 Palmes, Rev. W. L., Hornsea
 Pardoe, Mrs.
 Parker, Rev. A., Halliwell, near Bolton-
 le-Morris, Lancashire
 Parr, W. H., Esq., York
 Parr, Mrs. ditto
 Parr, Rev. R. H., Scarborough
 Parrington, Mrs.
 Parry, Mrs., Durham
 Parry, Miss
 Parry, Miss E. L. S.
 Parry, Miss B. L.
 Parry, Miss B. E. L.
 Parry, Miss M. A. L.
 Peake, Rev. J. R., Ellesmere Vicarage
 Peard, Miss, Sandfield, North Devon
 Peard, J. H., ditto ditto
 Pearson, Rev. George, Hopebourne House,
 Canterbury

Pearson, Rev. H. R. S., Lythe, Whitby
 Pearson, Mr. W. J.
 Pearson, Rev. E., Derby
 Pearson, Rev. J. G., Darlington, Durham
 Pearson, Mr. Councillor, York
 Pease, J. W., Esq., Haslewood, near Hull
 Pease, Rev. G., Darrington
 Peel, Rev. Frederick, Barassie House,
 Malvern
 Peel, Hon. Mrs. ditto
 Peddar, Rev. W., Garstang Vicarage, Lanc.
 Pelham, Rev. A. Thursby, Cound Rectory,
 Shrewsbury
 Pellew, Henry E., Esq., 22, Boltons,
 London, S.W.
 Perkins, Mrs., York
 Perry, Rev. S. G., Tottington, near Bury
 Pickard, Rev. H. A., Leeds
 Pigeon, Miss H., Clapham, London
 Pigott, Rev. G. W., Upton Magna, Salop
 Philips, Rev. G. H., The Mount, York
 Philips, Mrs., The Mount, York
 Phillimore, Sir Robert, Q.C., D.C.L., 5,
 Arlington Street, S.W.
 Phillips, Wm., Esq., York
 Phillpotts, Rev. Arthur, Harton P., South
 Shields.
 Platt, Rev. G. M., Whitkirk, Yorkshire
 Platt, Rev. J. L., Sedberg
 Plows, Rev. William, Barnham, Thetford
 Pluit, Miss
 Plumptre, Rev. W. A., Ewelme, Oxon
 Plumptre, Mrs. ditto
 Pollock, Rev. James S., S. Alban's, Bir-
 mingham
 Pollock, Rev. J. S., Bordesley, near Bir-
 mingham
 Pooah, Rev. J. O., Kendal
 Poole, Rev. G., Ayliffe, Welford
 Powell, Nathaniel, Esq., Church Institution
 London
 Powell, Rev. J. W. S., Abinger Rectory,
 Dorking, Surrey
 Powell, F., Esq., Knaresborough
 Powell, Mrs. F.
 Powell, Francis J., Esq., M.P., Horton,
 Bradford
 Powell, Nathaniel, Esq., Temple Street,
 Whitefriars, E.C.
 Powell, James, Esq., Harrogate
 Powell, Mrs. J. R., Alabama, U.S.,
 Pownall, Rev. G. P., St. John's Parsonage,
 Hoxton
 Porter, Mrs.
 Porter, Miss
 Pott, Rev. Francis
 Prescott, Rev. C., Ponteland, Northumber-
 land
 Prest, Archdeacon, Gateshead, Durham
 Prest, Miss H.
 Prest, Miss C.
 Preston, Rev. Canon, Bulmer
 Preston, Mr. H., Parliament Street, York
 Preston, Rev. C. M., Warcope


- Prettyman, Rev. H., Lowick, Northants
 Pritt, Rev. Francis D., Lancaster
 Proby, Miss, Devizes
 Procter, W., Esq., M.D., York
 Procter, Mrs., ditto
 Procter, Miss, ditto
 Procter, Rev. L., Bolton Percy
 Proude, Rev. G., Ruswarp, Whitby
 Prowde, Rev. Ralph, Ingleby, Greenhow
 Prowde, Rev. J., Cleckheaton
 Prowde, Rev. Geo., Faceby
 Pugh, Rev. M., Kisworth Grammar School,
 near Halifax, Yorkshire
 Pullein, Rev. J. M.
 Pullein, Mrs.
 Purchon, Miss, Leeds
 Purdue, Rev. G., Challow, Berks.
 Puxley, Rev. H. L., Cockermouth
 Pynsent, Rev. F. A., Bawdeswell Rectory,
 Norfolk
 Ripon, Lord Bishop of, Palace, Ripon
 Raine, Rev. Canon, York
 Randolph, Rev. Canon, Dunnington
 Rectory, York
 Randolph, Mrs., ditto
 Randolph, Miss
 Randolph, Miss H.
 Randolph, Rev. C., Staple, Kent
 Rankstill, Mr.
 Rawdon, W. F., Esq., York
 Rawson, Mr. W. H.
 Read, Miss, York
 Reed, W., Esq., York
 Reed, Mr.
 Reid, Rev. C., Hounslow
 Reid, Mrs.
 Reynolds, Mr.
 Riccalton, Miss C.
 Richards, Rev. E. V., Hickleton, near
 Doncaster
 Richardson, H., Esq., Cherry Hill, York
 Richardson, C., Esq., York
 Richardson, Mr. C., York
 Richardson, W., Esq., York
 Richardson, Mr. Alderman
 Richardson, C., Esq., Whitby
 Richardson, Mrs. C., Whitby
 Richardson, Rev. T., York
 Richmond, Rev. W. A., Limpley Stoke, Bath
 Richmond, Mrs.
 Richmond, Rev. H. J., Sherburn, Durham
 Ridley, Rev. Thomas, Sowerby, Halifax
 Roberts, Rev. R. E., Richmond Rectory,
 Yorkshire
 Roberts, Rev. Geo., Thornaby, Yorks.
 Robertson, Mr., Pavement, York
 Robertson, Rev. Divie, Henfield Hurst-
 pierpoint
 Robins, Rev. G. A., Hereford
 Robinson, Miss, York
 Robinson, Mrs.
 Robinson, Miss F.
 Robinson, Rev. J., Settle, Yorkshire
 Robinson, Wm., Esq., Burnley
 Robinson, Rev. J., York
 Robinson, W., Esq., York
 Robson, Rev. T., Kirdleatham, Redcar
 Rose, Rev. C., York
 Rose, Archdeacon, Houghton Conquest,
 near Amphill
 Rose, Miss
 Roundell, Rev. D. R., Gledstone Hall,
 Skipton
 Rowe, Rev. G., York
 Rudder, Rev. Dr., Philadelphia
 Russell, D., Esq., York
 Russell, Mrs., ditto
 Russell, Rev. W. B., Turvey, Bedford
 Russell, Mrs.
 Russell, Miss
 Russell, Mr. A. H.
 Russell, Mr. E. C.
 Russell, Rev. H. V., Burneston
 Robinson, Rev. Canon, Bolton
 Russell, Mr. G. H., York
 Rust, Rev. J. C., The Crescent, Norwich
 Rutson, W., Esq., Newby Wiske
 Sabben, Rev. J., York
 Sainer, Rev. N. H.
 Sale, Rev. C. H., Kirby, Boro'bridge
 Sale, Rev. Canon, D.D., Sheffield
 Sale, Rev. T. W., Attercliffe, Sheffield
 Saltmarshe, T., Esq., Stamford Bridge
 Sampson, Rev. S., Walton-on-the-Hill,
 near Liverpool
 Sampson, Rev. J. E., York
 Sampson, Miss
 Sampson, Mr., York
 Sanctuary, Archdeacon, Powerstock Vic-
 arage, Bridport
 Sanctuary, Mrs., ditto
 Sanderson, T., Esq., York
 Sandford, Archdeacon, Alvechurch Rec-
 tory, Bromsgrove
 Satterthwaite, Rev. C. J., Disley, Cheshire
 Saurin, Archdeacon, Seagoe, Portadown,
 Ireland
 Savory, Rev. W.
 Scadding, Rev. Henry, D.D., Toronto
 Schofield, Mrs.
 Schnibben, Rev. W. M., Bromfield, Cum-
 berland
 Schwabe, Rev. W. H., Great Cheverell, Wilts
 Scott, Rev. M. H., Warton, Lancashire
 Scott, Rev. J. H., Frosterley Parsonage,
 Darlington
 Scott, Rev. John, S. Mary's, Hull
 Scott, Rev. W. H., Church Institution,
 London
 Sedgwick, Rev. J. B., Copley Parsonage,
 Halifax
 Selwyn, Miss, Sandwell, Birmingham
 Sendall, Rev. S., Scampton, near Malton
 Serjeantson, Rev. W. J., Acton Burnall,
 Salop
 Severn, Mrs., Dringhouses, York


- Sewell, Rev. C., Grantham
 Seymour, Rev. Canon, Kinwarton, Alcester
 Seymour, Mrs., Clifton Manor, York
 Seymour, Miss, Ditto
 Seymour, J., Esq., York
 Seymour, Mrs. ditto
 Shadwell, Rev. Arthur, Langton, Malton
 Shann, Geo., Esq., M.D., York
 Shann, Mrs.
 Shann, Mr. Geo., Jun.
 Sharp, Rev. J., Horbury, near Wakefield
 Sharp, Wm., Esq., Warrington
 Sharp, Martin R., Esq., North Grove, Highgate, London
 Sharpe, Rev. C. O., Ince, near Chester
 Sheepshanks, Rev. T., Arthington, near Otley
 Sheppard, Rev. F., Patrington
 Sheppard, Mrs.
 Shield, Rev. W. Llansoy, Monmouthshire
 Shilleto, Miss, York
 Shilleto, Miss
 Shirley, Rev. Canon, D.D., Christ Church, Oxford
 Shooter, Rev. R. W.
 Shooter, Mrs. R. W.
 Short, Rev. H., Stockton, York
 Short, R. H., Esq., York
 Siddon, Miss, Huddersfield
 Simmons, Rev. T. F., Dalton Holme, Beverley
 Simpson, Rev. Philip, Massham Hall, near Howden
 Simpson, Rev. J. A., 2, Brunswick Terrace, Scarboro'
 Simpson, Miss, Hampstead
 Simpson, Mrs.
 Simpson, Miss
 Simpson, Rev. David, Hamilton Street, Brunswick Square, London
 Singleton, Rev. Corbet, York
 Slade, Rev. J. J., Netherton, Dudley, Worcester
 Slater, Mrs., Pickering
 Slater, Miss ditto
 Slington, E., Esq.
 Slocock, Rev. O. E., Chieveley, Newbury, Berks.
 Smith, Rev. F. J., Bishop's Hall, Taunton, Somerset
 Smith, Mr. R.
 Smith, Rev. Adam Clarke, Middlesboro', Yorks.
 Smith, F., Esq., London
 Smith, Mr.
 Smith, Rev. S. E., Pickering
 Smith, Miss A. D., ditto
 Smith Mrs. Charles
 Smith, Miss, York
 Smith, Rev. Henry, Bankfoot, Bradford
 Smith, James, Esq., Barton Villa, Malton
 Smith, Edward, Esq.
 Smith, Rev. B. T., Rusthall Common, Tunbridge Wells
 Smith, Rev. G. A., Malton
 Smithson, R. E., Esq., York
 Smithson, O., Esq., York
 Smithson, Mrs. O.
 Smyth, Col., Heath Hall, Wakefield
 Snow, Rev. Thos., Halifax, Yorks.
 Snowden, H., Esq., Leeds
 Snowdon, Rev. J., Ilkley Vicarage, Yorks.
 Snowdon, Miss
 Snowdon, Miss E.
 Sotheran, Miss, York
 Sowden, G., Hebden Bridge, Halifax
 Spencer, Rev. J. M., Kirby Moorside, Yorks.
 Springett, Rev. Robert, Brafferton, Boro'-bridge
 Spurrier, Rev. H., Horncastle, Lincolnshire
 Stainforth, Rev. R., Wheldrake, York
 Stainforth, W., Esq., ditto
 Stainforth, Miss K., ditto
 Stamer, Rev. Sir Lovelace, Bart., Stoke-upon-Trent
 Stamer, Lady ditto
 Stanhope, W. Spencer, Esq., Cannon Hall, Wakefield
 Stanmer, Rev. B. W., Arrow, Alcester
 Stansfield, Rev. John, Coniston Parsonage, Bell Bush, Leeds
 Stanton, Rev. W. H., Hazelton, near Cheltenham
 Steele, Rev. H. A., Maltby, Yorks.
 Steele, Rev. R., East Harisey, Yorks.
 Stephens, A. J., Esq., Q.C., D.C.L., 61, Chancery Lane
 Stephens, Rev. W. B., Seaforth, Liverpool
 Stephenson, S., Esq.
 Steward, Miss, Bishopthorpe, York
 Steward, H., Esq., York
 Stewart, Rev. Henry, Kilmore
 Stewart, Dr., Belfast
 Stewart, J. A. Shaw, Esq., London
 Stewart, Rev. John, West Derby, Liverpool
 Stewart, Rev. H.
 Stevens, Rev. H., Old Chapel, Sydenham, Kent
 Stringer, Rev. —
 Stocker, Rev. W. H. B., Horsforth Parsonage
 Stone, Rev. M. N., York
 Stone, Mrs., ditto
 Sturges, Rev. S., Wagrave Vicarage, Henley-on-Thames
 Sugden, Hon. and Rev. F., Hale Magna Vicarage, Lincolnshire
 Sugden, Hon. Mrs. F. ditto
 Sumner, Miss E.
 Sumner, Rev. J., Kirkthwaite, Sedburgh
 Sumner, Mrs. ditto
 Swaine, Miss, Pickering
 Swaine, Miss, York
 Swann, Rev. P. F., Rye, Sussex
 Swann, Miss, Ashfield
 Swann, Mrs. John, Askham Hall
 Swann, Miss F., ditto
 Swann, Rev. R., Brandsby, near York

- Walker, Rev. W. H., Necton, Norfolk
 Walsham, Rev. Charles, Holy Trinity,
 Paddington, Middlesex
 Ward, Rev. F. T.
 Ward, Mr.
 Ware, J. W., Esq., York
 Ware, Mrs.
 Ware, Rev. W. W., Doncaster
 Ware, Rev. H., Kirby Lonsdale
 Ware, Mr., Skirpenbeck
 Ware, Mrs., ditto
 Warner, Rev. Chas., Henley-on-Thames,
 Oxford
 Warrington, George, Esq., Apothecaries
 Hall, London
 Watkins, Rev. F., Thrybergh, Rotherham
 Watson, H., Esq. York
 Watson, Mrs.
 Watson, Miss, S. E.
 Watson, Mr. F.
 Watson, Miss M., Daventry
 Watson, Rev. C., Rufforth, York
 Watt, Rev. Robert, Cheadle, Staffordshire
 Weatherley, Mr. Alderman, York
 Webb, Rev. R. W. B., East Chillon,
 Wantage
 Wenlock, The Lord, Escrick Park, York
 Westhead, J. P. B., Esq., Lea Castle,
 Kidderminster, Worcestershire
 Westmorland, Rev. T., Brantingham,
 Yorkshire.
 Weston, Rev. G. F., Crosby Ravensworth
 Wetherall, Rev. A. W., Stone Grave,
 Oswaldkirk
 Wethered, Rev. F. T., Hurley, Berks
 Whaley, Rev. W. Askham Bryan, York
 Wharndiffe, The Lord, Wortley Hall
 Whitworth, Rev. W., Bacup, Lancashire
 White, Rev. T., Cowthorpe
 White, Miss
 White, Rev. J. H., Haxby, Yorkshire
 White, Rev. F., Gilbert, Beeford, Hull
 White, G. Esq., Linlagen
 White, Rev. H. M. Masboro', Rotherham
 White, Rev. W. H.
 Whitehead, Rev. W. C.
 Whytehead, W., Esq., Clifton, York
 Whytehead, Mrs., ditto
 Whytehead, Miss, ditto
 Whytehead, Miss F., ditto
 Wickenden, Rev. J. F., Stoke Bishop,
 Bristol
 Wightman, Rev. W. A. Holy Trinity,
 King's Square, York
 Wightman, T., Esq., York
 Wilde, Rev. Albert Sydney, Rectory, Louth
 Wilde, Mrs., ditto
 Wilkinson, Miss, Monkgate, York
 Wilkinson, Rev. C. T., St. Thomas's,
 Birmingham
 Wilkinson, Rev. E. G., Rischolme, Lin-
 colnshire
 Wilkinson, Rev. T. H., 44, Lincoln's Inn
 Fields, London
 Wilkinson, W. N., Castleford
 Wilkinson, Rev. W. D. D., Birmingham
 Wilkinson, Rev. G. H., Auckland, Durham
 Wilkinson, Rev. E. A., Tadbrough, Durham
 Wilkinson, D. S., Greenlays, Manchester
 Wilkinson, Miss
 Wilkinson, J., Esq., York
 Wilkens, Rev. A. D., Vicarage, Dewsbury
 Williams, Rev. J. M., Burnby, York
 Williams, W. G., York
 Williams, J. M., Esq.
 Williams, Mrs.
 Williamson, Rev. R. Hurworth, Durham
 Wilshire, Rev. C. W.
 Wilshire, C. W.
 Wilshire, W.
 Wilshire, E.
 Wilson, Rev. R. G.
 Wilson, Very Rev. David, Dean of
 Aberdeen, Woodhead
 Wilson, Rev. A. M., Ainstable, Penrith
 Wilson, Rev. A. B., Edgehill, Liverpool
 Wilson, Rev. W., Field Broughton, near
 Milnthorpe, Lancaster
 Wilson, Rev. J. Allen, Bolton Rectory,
 Clitheroe
 Wilson, Rev. J. G., West Heslerton
 Wilson, T., Esq.
 Wilton, Rev. R., Lonsborough
 Wimbush, Rev. Samuel, Terrington, York
 Winn, C., Esq., Nostell Priory, Wakefield
 Winslow, J. S., Esq., Askendale, Knaresbro'
 Wolfe, Ven. Archdeacon, Clontibret,
 Monaghan
 Wombwell, Colonel
 Wood, Mr. Alderman, York
 Wood, Mrs., York
 Wood, Miss E.
 Wood, Rev. John, Ripley, Derby
 Wood, J., Esq.
 Wood, Mrs.
 Wood, T. P., Esq.
 Wood, Mrs.
 Wood, Miss
 Wood, Miss E.
 Wood, Hon. C. L., Hickleton Hall, Don-
 caster
 Woodall, John, Esq., Scarborough
 Woodd, Basil, T., Esq., M.P., Knaresbro'
 Woodgate, Rev. Canon, Belbroughton,
 Worcester
 Woodward, Rev. H., St. Clement's, Fox-
 teth Park, Liverpool
 Worsley, Rev. J. H., Britannia Terrace,
 Saltburn
 Worthington, Rev. W. R., York
 Wrangham, Rev. R., Driffield
 Wray, Rev. C., St. Martin's, Liverpool
 Wray, Mrs.
 Wray, Wm., Esq.
 Wray, Miss
 Wray, Rev. Canon, Leven, Beverley
 Wright, Rev. C. S., Sheffield
 Wrixon, Rev. J., Malone, Belfast

Wright, Miss, Manchester	York, Sheriff of
Wright, Mr., Everton, Liverpool	Yarburgh, G. T., Esq., Heslington, York
Wright, Rev. J., Honington, Lincolnshire	Yeoman, Rev. Canon, Marston, York
Wright, Mrs.	Yeoman, G. D., Esq., York
Wright, Rev. W.	York, Edward, Esq., Wighill Park, York
Wright, Rev. I. P.	York, Miss
Wright, Miss, London	York, Miss H.
Wright, Rev. W. H., Everton, Liverpool	Yorke, Mrs., Fishergate House, York
Wrightson, Rev. Canon, Hemsworth, near Pontefract	Yorke, Miss
Wyvill, Rev. E., Riddendon, Keighley	Young, Rev. William D. C. L., Croxton, Cambridgeshire
York, Lord Archbishop of, the Palace, Bishopthorpe, <i>President</i>	Young, Rev. Peter, North Witham Rectory, Grantham
York, The Lord Mayor of, Middlethorpe Lodge	Young, Rev. Frederick, Walton, Aylesbury, Buckinghamshire
York, Honble. the Dean of, Deanery, York	Young, Rev. F. J., South Milford
	Young, Rev. J. E. M., York

[N.B.—The Purchasers of *Day Tickets* were not registered.]





3 2400 00670 4542

GTU Library
2400 Ridge Road
Berkeley, CA 94709
For renewals call (510) 649-2500
All items are subject to recall

